

*Deus Justificatus.*

TWO  
DISCOURSES  
OF  
ORIGINAL SIN,

Contained in two Letters

TO  
PERSONS of HONOUR,

Wherein the question is rightly  
stated, several objections answered,  
and the truth further cleared  
and proved by many arguments  
newly added or explain'd.

By *Jer. Taylor D.D.*

LONDON,  
Printed for *Richard Royston* 1656.

Deus Propitius

THE

DISCOURSE

OF

THE

DISCOURSE

OF

THE

DISCOURSE

OF

THE

DISCOURSE

OF

THE

DISCOURSE

OF



*Deus Justificatus,*

---

O R,

A Vindication of the  
glory of the Divine  
Attributes in the  
Question of  
**ORIGINAL SIN.**

Against the Presbyterian way of  
Understanding it.

---

By JER. TAYLOR, D.D.

---

*Lucretius.*

Nam neque tam facilis res ulla est, quin ea primum,  
Difficilis magis ad credendum constet —

---

L O N D O N,

Printed by R. N. for R. Royston at the  
Angel in Ivie-Lane. 1656.



---

TO THE  
RIGHT HONORABLE  
*and religious Lady,*

The Lady

CHRISTIAN,  
*Countesse Dowager of*  
Devonshire.

---

RIGHT HONORABLE

AND HIS

GRACE

THE

DUKE OF

DEVON

Madam,

**W**hen I reflect upon the infinite disputes which have troubled the public meetings of Christendom concerning Original sin, and how impatient and vext some men lately have been, when I offered to them my endeavours and conjectures concerning that Question, with purposes very differing from what were seen in the face of other mens designs, and had handled it so, that God might be glorified in the Article, and men might be instructed and edified in order to good life; I could not but

A. 3. think.

## The Preface.

think that wise Heathen said rarely well in his little adagy, relating to the present subject; Εἰς παραδοξὸν ἔφασκεν. Mankind was born to be a riddle, and our nativity is in the dark; for men have taken the liberty to think what they please, and to say what they think; and they affirme many things, and can prove but few things; and take the sayings of men for the Oracles of God, and bold affirmatives for convincing arguments; and Saint Pauls text must be understood by Saint Austins commentary, and Saint Austin shall be heard in all, because he spake against such men who in  
some

## The Preface. 3

*Some things were not to be heard, and after all, because his Doctrine was taken for granted by ignorant ages, and being received so long, was incorporated into the resolved Doctrine of the Church, with so great a firmnesse, it became almost a shame to examine what the world believed so unsuspecting-ly; and he that shall first attempt it, must resolve to give up a great portion of his reputation to be torn in pieces by the ignorant and by the zealous, by some of the learned, and by all the Envious; and they who love to teach in quiet, being at rest in their chaires and pul-*

pits will be froward when they are awakened, and rather then they will be suspected to have taught amisse, will justifie an error by the reproaching of him that tells them truth, which they are pleased to call new.

If any man differs from me in opinion, I am not troubled at it, but tell him that truth is in the understanding, and charity is in will, and is or ought to be there, before either his or my opinion in these controversies can enter, and therefore that we ought to love alike, though we do not understand alike; but when I finde that men are angry at my Ingenuity and opennesse of discourse



## The Preface. 5

course, and endeavour to hinder the event of my labours, in the ministry of Souls, and are impatient of contradiction or variety of explication, and understanding of Questions, I think my self concerned to defend the truth which I have published, to acquit it from the suspicion of evil appendages, to demonstrate not onely the truth, but the piety of it, and the necessity, and those great advantages which by this Doctrine so understood may be reaped, if men will be quiet and patient, void of prejudice and not void of Charity.

This (Madam) is reason

A 5      suffi-

## 6 The Preface.

sufficient why I offer so many justifications of my Doctrines, before any man appears in publick against it ; but because there are many who do enter into the houses of the rich and the honourable, and whisper secret oppositions and accusations rather then arguments against my Doctrines ; and the good women that are zealous for Religion, and make up in the passions of one faculty what is not so visible in the actions and operations of another, are sure to be affrighted before they be instructed, and men enter caveats in that Court before they try the cause. I have found, that some  
men

men, to whom I gave and designed my labours, and for whose sake I was willing to suffer the persecution of a suspected truth, have been so unjust to me, and so unserviceable to your Honour (Madam,) and to some other excellent and rare personages, as to tell stories, and give names to my proposition, and by secret murmurs hinder you from receiving that good which your wisdom and your piety would have discerned there, if they had not affrighted you with telling, that a snake lay under the Plantane, and that this Doctrine which is as wholesome as the fruits of Paradise, was

*was inwrapped with the infoldings of a Serpent, subtle and fallacious.*

Madam, I know the arts of these men; and they often put me in mind of what was told me by Mr. Sackvill the late Earl of Dorsets Uncle; that the cunning Sects of the World (he named the Jesuits and the Presbyterians) did more prevail by whispering to Ladies, then all the Church of England and the more sober Protestants could do by fine force and strength of argument. For they by prejudice or fears, terrible things, and zealous nothings, confident sayings and little stories, governing the

## The Preface.

9

the Ladies consciences, who can  
perswade their Lords, their  
Lords will convert their Te-  
nants, and so the World is all  
their own. I wish them all good  
of their profits and purchases;  
but yet because they are questions  
of Souls, of their interest and  
advantages; I cannot wish they  
may prevail with the more Re-  
ligious and Zealous Personages:  
and therefore (Madam) I have  
taken the boldnesse to write this  
tedious letter to your Honour,  
that I may give you a right un-  
derstanding and an easy expli-  
cation of this great Question; as  
conceiving my self the more  
bound to do it to your Honour,  
not

not onely because you are Zealous for the Religion of this Church, and are a person as well of reason as of Honour, but also because you have passed divers obligations upon me, for which, all my services are too little a return.

Deus

# *Deus Justificatus,*

---

OR,

## A Vindication of the Divine Attributes.

**I**N Order to which, I will plainly describe the great lines of difference and danger, which are in the errors and mistakes about this Question.

2. I will prove the truth and necessity of my own, together with the usefulness and reasonableness of it.

3. I will answer those little murmurs, by which (so far as I can yet learn) these men seek to invade the understandings of those who have not leisure or will to examine the thing it self in my own words and arguments.

4. And if any thing else falls in by the bye, in which I can give satisfaction

tion to a Person of Your great Worthiness, I will not omit it, as being desirous to have this Doctrine stand as fair in your eyes, as it is in all its own colours and proportions.

But first ( Madam ) be pleased to remember that the question is not whether there bee any such thing as *Originall Sin* ; for it is certain, and confessed on all hands almost. For my part, I cannot but confess that to be, which I feel, and groan under, and by which all the World is miserable.

*Adam* turned his back upon the Sun, and dwelt in the dark and the shadow; he sinned, and fell into Gods displeasure, and was made naked of all his supernaturall endowments, and was ashamed and sentenced to death, and deprived of the means of long life, and of the Sacrament and instrument of Immortality,



ty, I mean the Tree of Life; he then fell under the evils of a sickly body, and a passionate, ignorant, uninstru-  
cted soul; his sin made him sickly, his sickliness made him peevish, his sin left him ignorant, his ignorance made him foolish and unreasonable: His sin left him to his nature, and by his nature, who ever was to be born at all, was to be born a child, and to do before he could understand, & bred under Laws, to which he was alwayes bound, but which could not always be exacted; and he was to choose, when he could not reason, and had passions most strong, when he had his understanding most weak, and was to ride a wilde horse without a bridle, and the more need he had of a curb, the less strength he had to use it, and this being the case of all the World, what was *every mans* evil, became all mens greater evil; and though  
alone

alone it was very bad, yet when they came together it was made much worse; like Ships in a storm, every one alone hath enough to do to out-ride it; but when they meet, besides the evils of the storm, they find the intolerable calamitie of their mutuall concussion, and every ship that is ready to be oppressed with the tempest, is a worse tempest to every vessell, against which it is violently dashed. So it is in mankind, every man hath evill enough of his own; and it is hard for a man to live soberly, temperately, and religiously; but when he hath Parents and Children, brothers and sisters, friends and enemies, buyers and sellers, Lawyers and Physitians, a family and a neighbourhood, a King over him, or Tenants under him, a Bishop to rule in matters of Government spirituall, and a People to be rul'd by him in the affaires of

*the Divine Attributes.* 15

of their Souls, then it is that every man dashes against another, and one relation requires what another denies; and when one speaks, another will contradict him; and that which is well spoken, is sometimes innocently mistaken, and that upon a good cause, produces an evill effect, and by these, and ten thousand other concurrent causes, man is made more then most miserable.

But the main thing is this; when God was angry with *Adam*; the man fell from the state of grace; for God withdrew his grace, and we returned to the state of meer nature, of our prime creation. And although I am not of *Petrus Diaconus* his mind, who said, that when we all fell in *Adam*, we fell into the dirt, and not only so, but we fell also upon a heap of stones; so that we not onely were made naked, but defiled also, and broken all in pieces; yet  
this

this I believe to be certain, that we by his fall received evill enough to undoe us, and ruine us all; but yet the evill did so descend upon us, that we were left in powers & capacities to serve and glorifie God; Gods service was made much harder, but not impossible; mankind was made miserable, but not desperate, we contracted an actuall mortality, but we were redeemable from the power of Death; sinne was easie and ready at the door, but it was resistable; Our *will* was abused, but yet not destroyed; our Understanding was cosened, but yet still capable of the best instructions; and though the Devill had wounded us, yet God sent his Son, who like the good Samaritan poured Oyle and Wine into our wounds, and we were cured before we felt the hurt, that might have ruined us upon that Occasion. It is sad enough, but not alto-

*the Divine Attributes.* 17

altogether so intolerable, and decre-  
retory, which the *Silylline* Oracle  
describes to be the effect of *Adams*  
sin.

Ἀνθρωπος, πέπλασαι θεῷ παλα-  
μαῖς ἐνὶ αὔραις

Οὐ τε πλάνησεν ὄφιν, δόλιον ἐπὶ  
μοῖραν ἀνέλθειν

Τὸ θανάτῳ γινῶσιν τε λαβεῖν ἀγαθῶ  
τε κακῶ τε.

*Man was the worke of God, fram'd  
by his hands,*

*Him did the Serpent cheat, that to  
deaths bands*

*He was subjected for his sin : for  
this was all,*

*He tasted good and evill by his  
fall.*

But to this we may superadde that  
which *Plutarch* found to be experi-  
mentally true, *Mirum quod pedes*  
*move-*

*moverunt ad usum rationis, nullo autem frenopassiones*: the foot moves at the command of the Will and by the empire of reason, but the passions are stiff even then when the knee bends, and no bridle can make the Passions regular and temperate. And indeed (Madam) this is in a manner the sum total of the evill of our abused and corrupted nature; Our soul is in the body as in a Prison; it is there *tanquam in alienâ domo*, it is a sojourner, and lives by the bodies measures, and loves and hates by the bodies Interests and Inclinations; that which is pleasing and nourishing to the body, the soul chooses and delights in: that which is vexatious and troublesome, it abhorres, and hath motions accordingly; for Passions are nothing else but acts of the Will, carried to or from materiall Objects, and effects and impresses upon the man, made by such acts;

acts; consequent motions and productions from the Will It is an useless and a groundless proposition in Philosophy, to make the Passions to be distinct faculties, and seated in a differing region; for as the reasonable soul is both sensitive and vegetative, so is the Will elective and passionate, the region both of choice and passions, that is, When the Object is immateriall, or the motives such, the act of the Will is so meerly intellectuall, that it is then spirituell, and the acts are proper and Symbolical; but if the Object is materiall or corporall, the acts of the Will are adhæſion and averſation, and these it receives by the needs and inclinations of the body; now because many of the bodies needs are naturally necessary, and the rest are made so by being thought needs, and by being so naturally pleasant, and that this is the bodies day

day, and it rules here in its own place and time, therefore it is that the will is so great a scene of passion and we so great servants of our bodies.

This was the great effect of *Adams* sin which became theretore to us a punishment because of the appendant infirmity that went along with it; for *Adam* being spoiled of all the rectitudes and supernatural heights of grace, and thrust back to the form of nature, and left to derive grace to himself by a new Oeconomy, or to be without it; and his posterity left just so as he was left himself; he was permitted to the power of his enemy that betray'd him, and put under the power of his body whose appetites would govern him; and when they would grow irregular could not be mastered by any thing that was about him, or born with him,



him, so that his case was miserable and naked, and his state of things was imperfect and would be disordered.

But now Madam, things being thus bad, are made worse by the superinduced Doctrines of men, which when I have represented to your Ladiship and told upon what accounts I reprove them, your Honour will finde that I have reason.

There are one sort of *Calvins* Scholars whom we for distinctions sake call *Supralapsarians*, who are so fierce in their sentences of predestination and reprobation, that they say God look'd upon mankind onely, as his Creation, and his slaves, over whom he having absolute power, was very gracious that he was pleased to take some few, and save them absolutely; and to the other greater part he did no wrong,

B                      though

24 *A Vindication of*

though he was pleased to damn them eternally, onely because he pleased; for they were his own; and *Qui jure suo utitur nemini facit injuriam* saies the law of reason, every one may do what he please with his own. But this bloody and horrible opinion is held but by a few; as tending directly to the dishonour of God, charging on Him alone that He is the cause of mens sins on Earth, and of mens eternal torments in Hell; it makes God to be powerfull, but his power not to be good; it makes him more cruel to men, then good men can be to Dogs and sheep; it makes him give the final sentence of Hell without any pretence or colour of justice; it represents him to be that which all the World must naturally fear, and naturally hate, as being a God delighting in the death of innocents; for so they are when he resolves to damn

*the Divine Attributes.* 25

damn them : and then most tyrannically, cruel, and unreasonable; for it saies that to make a postnate pretence of justice, it decrees that men inevitably shall sin, that they may inevitably, but justly, be damned; like the *Roman Licitors* who because they could not put to death *Sejanus* daughters as being Virgins, deflowered them after sentence, that by that barbarity they might be capable of the utmost Cruelty; it makes God to be all that thing that can be hated; for it makes him neither to be good, nor just, nor reasonable; but a mighty enemy to the biggest part of mankinde; it makes him to hate what himself hath made, and to punish that in another which in himself he decreed should not be avoided : it charges the wisdom of God with folly, as having no means to glorifie his justice, but by doing unjustly, by bringing in

that which himself hates, that he might do what himself loves : doing as *Tiberius* did to *Brutus* and *Nero* the Sons of *Germanicus*;

*Variâ fraude induxit ut concitarentur ad convitia, et concitati perderentur;*

Sueton.  
in vita.  
liber.c.

54.

provoking them to raile, that he might punish their reproachings. This opinion reproaches the words and the Spirit of Scripture, it charges God with Hypocrisy and want of Mercy, making him a Father of Cruelties, not of Mercie, and is a perfect overthrow of all Religion, and all Lawes, and all Government; it destroyes the very being, and nature of all Election, thrusting a man down to the lowest form of beasts and birds, to whom a Spontaneity of doing certain actions is given by God, but it is in them so naturall, that it is unavoidable. Now concerning this horrid opinion, I  
for

for my part shall say nothing but this; that he that sayes there was no such man as *Alexander*, would tell a horrible lie, and be injurious to all story, and to the memory and fame of that great Prince, but he that should say, It is true there was such a man as *Alexander*, but he was a Tyrant, and a Blood-sucker, cruel and injurious, false and dissembling, an enemy of mankind, and for all the reasons of the world to be hated and reproached, would certainly dishonour *Alexander* more, and be his greatest enemy: So I think in this, That the Atheists who deny there is a God, do not so impiously against God, as they that charge him with foul appellatives, or maintain such sentences, which if they were true, God could not be true. But these men (Madam) have nothing to do in the Question of Originall Sin, save onely, that they say that

God did decree that *Adam* should fall, and all the sins that he sinn'd, and all the world after him are no effects of choice, but of predestination, that is, they were the actions of God, rather than man.

But because these men even to their brethren seem to speak evil things of God, therefore the more wary and temperat of the *Calvinists* bring down the order of reprobation lower; affirming that God looked upon all mankind in *Adam* as fallen into his displeasure, hated by God, truly guilty of his sin, liable to Eternal damnation, and they being all equally condemned, he was pleased to separate some, the smaller number far, and irresistibly bring them to Heaven; but the far greater number he passed over, leaving them to be damned for the sin of *Adam*, and so they think they save Gods Justice; and this was  
the

the designe and device of the Synod of *Dort*.

Now to bring this to passe, they teach concerning Original sin,

1. That by this sin our first Parents fell from their Original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sinne and wholly defiled in all the faculties, and parts of soul and body.

2. That whatsoever death was due to our first Parents for this sin, they being the root of all mankind, and the guilt of this sin, being imputed, the same is conveyed to all their posterity by ordinary generation.

3. That by this Original corruption we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evill; and that from hence proceed all actual transgressions.

4. This corruption of nature remains

B. 4.

maines in the regenerate, and although it be through Christ pardoned and mortified, yet both it self and all the motions thereof, are trulie and properly sin.

5. Original sin being a transgression of the righteous Law of God, and contrary thereunto, doth in its own nature bring guilt upon the sinner whereby he is bound over to the wrath of God and curse of the Law, and so made subject to death with all miseries, spiritual, temporall, and eternal. These are the sayings of the late Assembly at *Westminster*.

Against this heap of errors and dangerous propositions I have made my former discourfings, and statings of the Question of Original sin. These are the Doctrines of the *Presbyterian*, but as unlike truth, as his assemblies are to our Church; for concerning him I may say.

*Nemo*

*9. 4. 2. v. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30.*



*Nemo tam propè proculq; nobis.*

He is the likest and the unlikest  
to a Son of our Church in the world;  
he is neereſt to us and furtheſt from  
us; and to all the world abroad he  
calls himſelf our friend, while at  
home he hates us and deſtroys  
us.

Now I shall first speak to the thing in general and its designs, then I shall make some observations upon the particulars.

i. This device of our *Presbyterians* and of the Synod of *Dort* is but an artifice to save their proposition harmless, & to stop the out-cries of Scripture and reason, and of all the World against them. But this way of stating the article of reprobation is as horrid in effect as the other. For

1. Is it by a natural consequent:

B55

that

that we are guilty of *Adams* sin, or is it by the decree of God? Naturally it cannot be; for then the sins of all our forefathers, who are to their posterity the same that *Adam* was to his, must be ours; and not onely *Adams* first sin, but his others are ours upon the same account. But if it be by the De-

cree of God, by his choice and constitution, that it should be so. (as *Mr. Calvin* and *Dr. Twisse* (that I may name no more for that side, do expressly teach) it followes, that God is the Author of our

*Instit. l.*

3. c. 23.

*Sect. 7.*

*Vind.*

*Grat. l. 1.*

p. 1. di-

gres. 4.

c. 3.

Sin; So that I may use *Mr. Calvins* words; "How is it that so many  
" Nations with their Children  
" should be involved in the fall  
" without remedy, but because  
God would have it so? and if that  
be the matter, then to God, as to  
the

the cause, must that sin, and that damnation be accounted.

And let it then be considered, whether this be not as bad as the worst, For the *Supralapsarians* say, God did decree that the greatest part of mankind should perish, only because he would: The *Sublapsarians* say, That God made it by his decree necessary, that all wee who were born of *Adam* should be born guilty of Originall Sin, and he it was who decreed to damne whom he pleased for that sin, in which he decreed they should be born; and both these he did for no other consideration, but because he would. Is it not therefore evident, that he absolutely decreed Damnation to these Persons? For he that decrees the end, and he that decrees the onely necessary and effective meanes to the end, and decrees that it shall be the end of that means, does decree absolute

# 34 *A Vindication of the*

lutely alike ; though by several dispensations : And then all the evill consequents which I reckoned before to be the monstrous productions of the first way ; are all Daughters of the other ; and if *Solomon* were here, he could not tell which were the truer Mother.

Now that the case is equall between them , some of their own chiefest do confess , so *Dr. Twisse*. If God may ordain Men to Hell for *Adam's* sin , which is derived unto them by Gods onely constitution : he may as well do it absolutely without any such constitution : The same also is affirmed by *Maccovius*, and by Mr. *Calvin* : and the reason is plain ; for he that does a thing for a reason which himself makes , may as well do it without a reason, Or he may make his owne Will to be the reason, because the thing, and the motive of the

*Disp.* 18.

*Inst.* lib.

3. cap. 23.

*Sect.* 23.

the thing, come in both cases, equally from the same principle, and from that alone.

Now (Madam) be pleased to say, whether I had not reason and necessity for what I have taught : You are a happy Mother of an Honorable Posterity, your Children and Nephews are Deare to you as your right eye, and yet you cannot love them so well as God loves them, and it is possible that a Mother should forget her Children, yet God even then will not, cannot; but if our Father and Mother forsake us, God taketh us up : Now Madam consider, could you have found in your heart when the Nurses and Midwives had bound up the heads of any of your Children, when you had born them with pain and joy upon your knees, could you have been tempted to give command that murderers should be brought to slay them alive, to put them to exquisite tortures;

## 36 *A Vindication of*

tures, and then in the midst of their saddest groans, throw any one of them into the flames of a fierce fire, for no other reason, but because he was born at Latimers, or upon a Friday, or when the Moon was in her prime, or for what other reason you had made, and they could never avoid? could you have been delighted in their horrid shrieks and out-cries, and taking pleasure in their unavoidable and their intollerable calamity? could you have smiled, if the hangman had snatched your Eldest Son from his Nurses breasts, and dashed his brains out against the pavement; and would you not have wondred that any Father or Mother could espie the innocence and pretty smiles of your sweet babes, and yet tear their limbs in pieces, or devise devilish artifices to make them roar with intollerable convulsions? could you desire to be thought good, and yet

yet have delighted in such cruelty? I know I may answer for you; you would first have dyed your self. And yet say again, God loves mankind better then we can love one another, and he is essentially just, and he is infinitely mercifull, and he is all goodness, and therefore though we might possibly do evil things, yet he cannot, and yet this doctrine of the Presbyterian reprobation, saies he both can and does things, the very apprehension of which hath caused many in despair to drown or hang themselves.

Now if the Doctrine of absolute Reprobation be so horrid, so intolerable a proposition, so unjust and blasphemous to God, so injurious and cruell to men, and that there is no colour or pretence to justify it, but by pretending our guilt of *Adams* sin, and damnation to be the punishment: then because from  
truth

truth nothing but truth can issue; that must needs be a lie, from which such horrid consequences do proceed. For the case in short is this; If it be just for God to damne any one of *Adam's* Posterity for *Adam's* sin, then it is just in him to damne a'l; for all his Children are equally guilty; and then if he spares any, it is Mercy: and the rest who perish have no cause to complain. But if all these fearful consequences which Reason and Religion so much abhor do so certainly follow from such doctrines of Reprobation, and these doctrines wholly rely upon this pretence, it follows, that the pretence is infinitely false and intolerable; and that it cannot be just for God to damne us for being in a state of calamity, to which state we entred no way but by his constitution and decree.

You see, Madam, I had reason to reprove:



reprove that doctrine, which said, It was just in God to damne us for the sinne of *Adam*.

Though this be the maine error; yet there are some other collaterall things which I can by no means approve, such is that. 1. That by the Sin of *Adam* our Parents became wholly defiled in all the faculties and Powers of their souls and bodies. And 2. That by this we also are disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evill. And 3. That from hence proceed all actuall transgressions. And 4. that our naturall corruption in the regenerate still remains, and is still properly a sin.

Against this, I opposed these Propositions; That the effect of *Adams* sin was in himself bad enough; for it devested him of that state of grace and favour where God placed him; it threw him from Paradise, and all the

the advantages of that place, it left him in the state of Nature; but yet his nature was not spoiled by that sin; he was not wholly inclined to all evill, neither was he disabled and made opposite to all good; only his good was imperfect, it was naturall and fell short of heaven; for till his nature was invested with a new nature, he could go no further then the designe of his first Nature, that is, without Christ, without the Spirit of Christ, he could never arrive at heaven, which is his supernaturall condition; But 1. There still remained in him a naturall freedom of doing good or evill. 2. In every one that was born, there are great inclinations to some good. 3. Where our Nature was averse to good, it is not the direct *sin of Nature*, but the imperfection of it, the reason being, because God superinduced Lawes against our naturall inclination, and yet

*the Divine Attributes.* 41

yet there was in nature nothing sufficient to make us contradict our nature in obedience to God; all that being to come from a supernaturall and Divine principle. These I shall prove together, for one depends upon another.

1. And first, that the liberty of will did not perish to mankind by the fall of *Adam* is so evident, that *St. Austin* who is an adversary in some parts of this Question, but not yet, by way of question and confi-

dence asks, *Quis autem nostrum dicat quod primi hominis peccato perierit liberum arbitrium de humano genere?* Which of us

Lib. 1. ad  
Bonifac.  
c. 2.

can say, That the liberty of our Will did perish by the sin of the first Man? And he adds a rare reason; for it is so certain, that it did not perish in a sinner, that this thing onely is it by which they do sinne, especially when

when they delight in their sinne, and by the love of sin, that thing is pleasing to them which they list to do. ] And therefore when we are charged with sin, it is worthy of inquiry, whence it is that we are sinners? Is it by the necessity of nature, or by the liberty of our Will? If by nature, and not choice, then it is good and not evil; for whatsoever is our Nature is of Gods making, and consequently is good; but if we are sinners by choice & liberty of will, whence had we this libertie? If from *Adam*, then we have not lost it; but if we had it not from him, then from him we do not derive all our sin; for by this liberty alone we sin.

If it be replied, that wee are free to sin, but not to good; it is such a foolery, and the cause of the mistake so evident, and so ignorant, that I wonder any man of Learning or common sense should own it. For  
if

*the Divine Attributes.* 43

if I be free to evill; then I can chuse evill, or refuse it; If I can refuse it, then I can do good; for to refuse that evill is good, and it is in the Commandement [ *Eschew evill* ] but if I cannot choose or refuse it, how am I free to evill? For *Voluntas* and *libertas*, *Will* and *Liberty* in Philosophy are not the same: I may will it, when I cannot will the contrary; as the Saints in Heaven, and God himself wills good; they can not will evill; because to do so is imperfection and contrary to felicity; but here is no liberty; for liberty is with power, to do, or not to do; to do this or the contrary; and if this liberty be not in us, we are not in the state of obedience, or of disobedience; which is the state of all them who are alive, who are neither in hell nor Heaven. But that our case is otherwise, if I had no other argument in the world, and were never  
so

## 44      *A Vindication of*

so prejudicate and obstinate a person, I think I should be perfectly convinced by those words of *S. Paul* *1 Cor. 7. 37*. The Apostle speaks of a good act tending not onely to the keeping of a Precept, but to a counsel of perfection; & concerning that, he hath these words; *Neverthelesse, he that standeth stedfast in his heart, having no necessity, but hath power over his own will, and hath so decreed in his heart that he will keep his Virgin, doth well*; The words are plain, and need no explication. If this be not a plain liberty of choice, and a power of will, then words mean nothing, and we can never hope to understand one anothers meaning. But if sinne be avoidable, then wee have liberty of choice. If it be unavoidable, it is not imputable by the measures of Lawes, and Justice; what it is by Empire and Tyranny, let the Adversaries inquire and  
 prove:

*the Divine Attributes.* 45

prove: But since all Theology, all Schools of learning consent in this, that an invincible or unavoidable ignorance does wholly excuse from sin; why an invincible and an unavoidable necessity shall not also excuse, I confesse I have not yet been taught.

But if by *Adam's* sinne wee be so utterly indisposed, disabled, and opposite to all good, wholly inclined to evill, and from hence come all actuall finnes, that is, That by *Adam* we are brought to that passe, that we cannot chuse but sinne: it is a strange severity, that this should descend upon Persons otherwise most innocent, and that this which is the most grievous of all evils; *prima & maxima peccantium poena est peccasse.* (Seneca) To be given over to sin, is the worst calamity, the most extreme anger never inflicted directly at all for any sinne, as I have  
other-

## 46 *A Vindication of the*

therwise proved, and not indirectly,  
but upon the extremest anger;

*Doctr. and  
Pract. of  
Repent.* which cannot be sup-  
posed, unlesse God be  
more angry with us for  
being born Men, then  
for choosig to be sinners.

The Consequent of these Argu-  
ments is this; That our faculties are  
not so wholly spoiled by *Adams* fall,  
but that we can chooise good or e-  
vill, that our nature is not wholly  
disabled and made opposite to all  
good: But to nature are left and gi-  
ven as much as to the handmaid *A-*  
*gar*; nature hath nothing to do with  
the inheritance, but she and her  
sons have gifts given them; and by  
nature we have Laws of Virtue and  
inclinations to Virtue, and natural-  
ly we love God, and worship him,  
and speak good things of him, and  
love our Parents, and abstain from  
incestuous mixtures, and are pleased  
when



when we do well, and affrighted within when we sin in horrid instances against God, all this is in Nature, and much good comes from Plinius.

Nature, *neque enim quasi lassæ* ep. 12. lib.

*Effæta natura est, ut nihil jam laudabile pariat*; Nature is not so old, so absolute and dried a trunck as to bring no good fruits upon its own stock; and the French-men have a good proverb, *Bonus sanguis non mentitur*, a good blood never lies; and some men are naturally chaste, and some are abstemious, and many are just and friendly, and noble and charitable: and therefore all actual sins do not proceed from this sin of *Adam*; for if the sin of *Adam* left us in liberty to sin, and that this liberty was before *Adams* fall; then it is not long of *Adams* fall that we sin; by his fall it should rather be that we cannot choose but do this or that,

C

and

# 48 *A Vindication of*

and then it is no sin; But to say that our actuall sins should any more proceed from *Adams* fall, then *Adams* fall should proceed from it self, is not to be imagined, for what made *Adam* sin when he fell? If a fatal decree made him sin, then he was nothing to blame.

*Fati ista culpa est  
Nemo fit fato nocens*

No guilt upon mankinde can lie  
For whats the fault of destiny.

And *Adam* might with just reason lay the blame from himself, and say as *Agamemnon* did in *Homer*,

— ἐγὼ δ' ἐκ ἄλλοις εἶμι  
Ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς κὶ μοῖρα, κὶ ἡεργ-  
ραῖος Εὐρυπύς.

It

*the Divine Attributes.* 49

It was not I that sinned, but it was fate or a fury, it was God and not I, it was not my act, but the effect of the Divine decree, and then the same decree may make us sin, and not the sin of *Adam* be the cause of it. But if a liberty of will made *Adam* sin, then this liberty to sin being still left us, this liberty and not *Adams* sin is the cause of all our actual.

Concerning the other clause in the *Presbyterian* article, that our natural corruption in the regenerate still remaines, and *is still a sin, and properly a sin* : I have ( I confesse ) heartily opposed it, and shall besides my arguments, confute it with my blood, if God shall call me ; for it is so great a reproach to the spirit and power of Christ, and to the effects of Baptisme, to Scripture and to right reason, that all good people are bound in Consci-

50 *A Vindication of the*

ence to be zealous against it.

For when Christ came to reconcile us to his Father, he came to take away our sins, not onely to pardon them, but to destroy them; and if the regenerate, in whom the spirit of Christ rules, and in whom all their habitual sins are dead, are still under the servitude and in the stock's of Original sin, then it follows, not onely that our guilt of *Adams* sin is greater then our own actual, the sin that we never consented to, is of a deeper grain then that which we have chosen and delighted in, and God was more angry with *Cain* that he was born of *Adam*, then that he kill'd his Brother; and *Judas* by descent from the first *Adam* contracted that sin which he could never be quit of: but he might have been quit of his betraying the second *Adam*, if he would not have despaired;

*the Divine Attributes.* 51

red; I say not onely these horrid consequences do follow, but this also will follow; that *Adams* sin hath done some mischief that the grace of Christ can never cure; and generation stains so much, that regeneration cannot wash it clean. Besides all this; if the natural corruption remaines in the regenerate and be properly a sin, then either Gods hates the regenerate, or loves the sinner, and when he dies he must enter into Heaven, with that sin, which he cannot lay down but in the grave: as the vilest sinner layes down every sin; and then an unclean thing can go to Heaven, or else no man can; and lastly, to say that this natural corruption, though it be *pardoned* and *mortified*, yet still remaines, and is stil a sin, is perfect non-sence; for if it be *mortified*, it is not, it hath no being; if it is *pardoned* it was indeed, but now is no sin; for

till a man can be guilty of sin without obligation to punishment, a sin cannot be a sin that is pardoned; that is, if the obligation to punishment or the guilt be taken away, a man is not guilty. Thus far (Madam) I hope you will think I had reason.

One thing more I did and do reprove in their *Westminster* articles: and that is, that Original sin, meaning, our sin derived from *Adam*, is contrary to the law of God and doth in its own nature bring guilt upon the sinner; binding him over to Gods wrath &c. that is, that the sin of *Adam* imputed to us is properly, formally, and inhærently a sin. If it were properly a sin in us, *our sin*, it might indeed be damnable; for every transgression of the Divine Commandment is so: but because I have proved it cannot bring eternal damnation, I can as well

*the Divine Attributes.* 53

well argue thus : this sin cannot justly bring us to damnation, therefore it is not properly a sin : as to say ; this is properly a sin, therefore it can bring us to damnation. Either of them both follow well : but because they cannot prove it to be a sin properly, or any other wayes but by a limited imputation to certain purposes ; they cannot say it infers damnation. But because I have proved, it cannot infer damnation, I can safely conclude, it is not formally, properly, and inherently a sin in us.

*Nec placet ô superi vobis cum ver-  
tere cuncta*

*Propositum, nostris erroribus addere  
crimen,*

Nor did it please our God, when  
that our state  
Was chang'd, to adde a crime un-  
to our fate,

I have now (Madam) though  
much to your trouble quitted my  
self of my *Presbyterian* opponents,  
so far as I can judge fitting for the  
present: but my friends also take  
some exceptions; and there are some  
objections made, and blows given  
me as it happened to our Blessed  
Saviour, *in domo illorum qui dilige-  
bant me*; in the house of my Mo-  
ther and in the societies of some of  
my Dearest Brethren, For the case  
is this.

They



*the Divine Attributes.* 55

They joyn with me in all this that I have said; *viz.* That Original sin is ours onely by imputation; that it leaves us still in our natural liberty, and though it hath devested us of our supernaturals, yet that our nature is almost the same, and by the grace of Jesus as capable of Heaven as it could ever be, by derivation of Original rightousnesse from *Adam*. In the conduct and in the description of this Question, being usually esteemed to be onely Scholastical, I confesse they (as all men else) do usually differ; for it was long ago observ'd, that there are 16. several famous opinions, in this one Question of Original sin. But my Brethren, are willing to confesse, that for *Adams* sin alone no man did or shall ever perish. And that it is rather to be called a stain then a sin. If they were all of one minde and one voice in this

article, though but thus far, I would not move a stone to disturb it, but some draw one way and some another, and they that are aptest to understand the whole secret, do put fetters and bars upon their own understanding by an importune regard to the great names of some dead men, who are called *masters upon earth*, and whose authority is as apt to mislead us into some propositions, as their learning is usefull to guide us in others: but so it happens, that because all are not of a minde, I cannot give account of every disagreeing man; but of that which is most material I shall. Some learned persons are content I should say no man is damned for the sin of *Adam* alone; but yet that we stand guilty in *Adam*, and redeemed from this damnation by Christ; and if that the article were so stated, it would  
not:

*the Divine Attributes.* 57

not intrench upon the *justice* or the *goodnesse* of God ; for *his justice* would be sufficiently declared, because no man can complain of wrong done him when the evil that he fell into by *Adam* is taken off by Christ ; and *his goodnesse* is manifest in making a new *Census* for us, taxing and numbring us in Christ, and giving us free Redemption by the blood of Jesus : but yet that we ought to confess that we are liable to damnation by *Adam*, and saved from thence by *Christ* ; that Gods *justice* may be glorified in *that*, and his *goodnesse* in *this*, but that we are still real sinners till washed in the blood of Lamb ; and *without God*, and without hopes of heaven, till then : and that if this article be thus handled, the *Presbyterian* fancie will disappear ; for they can be confuted without denying *Adams* sin to be dam-

damnable; by saying it is pardoned in Christ, and in Christ all men are restored, and he is the head of the Predestination; for in him God looked upon us when he designed us to our final state: and this say they is much for the honour of Christs Redemption.

To these things (Madam) I have much to say; some thing I will trouble your Ladiship withal at this time, that you and all that consider the particulars may see, I could not do the work of God and truth if I had proceeded in that method. For

I. It is observable that those wiser persons, who will by no means admit that any one is or ever shall be damned for Original sin, do by this means hope to salve the justice of God; by which they plainly imply that to damn us for this, is hard and intolerable; and therefore they

*the Divine Attributes.* 59

they suppose they have declared a remedy. But then this also is to be considered ; if it be intolerable to damn children for the sin of *Adam*, then it is intolerable to say it is *damnable* ; If that be not just or reasonable, then this is also unjust and unreasonable ; for the sentence and the execution of the sentence are the same emanation and issue of justice and are to be equally accounted of. For.

2. I demand, had it been just in God, to damn all mankind to the eternal paines of hell, for *Adams* sin, committed before they had a being, or could consent to it, or know of it ? if it could be just, then any thing in the world can be just, and it is no matter who is innocent, or who is criminal directly and by choice, since they may turn Devils in their Mothers bellies ; and it matters not whether there be any  
laws.

laws or no, since it is all one that there be no law, and that we do not know whether there be or no; and it matters not whether there be any judicial procelle, for we may as well be damned without judgment, as be guilty without action: and besides, all those arguments will presse here, which I urged in my first discourse. Now if it had been unjust actually to damn us all for the sin of one, it was unjust to sentence us to it; for if he did give sentence against us justly, he could justly have executed the sentence; and this is just, if that be. But

3. God did put this sentence in execution; for when he sent the Holy Jesus into the world, to die for us and to Redeem us, he satisfied his Fathers Anger, for Original sin as well as for actual; he paid all the price of that as well as of this damnation; and the horrible

## *the Divine Attributes. 61*

rible sentence was brought off; and God was so satisfied that his justice had full measure; for so all men say who speak the voice of the Church in the matter of Christs satisfaction, so that now, although there was the goodnesse of God, in taking the evil from us; yet how to reconcile this processe with his justice, *viz.* That for the sin of another their God should sentence all the world to the portion of devils to eternal ages; and that he would not be reconciled to us, or take off this horrible sentence, without a full price to be paid to his justice; by the Saviour of the world, *this, this* is it that I require may be reconciled to, that Notion which we have of the Divine justice.

4. If no man shall ever be damned for the sin of *Adam* alone, then I demand whether are they born quitt from the guilt; or when they  
are

## 62 *A Vindication of*

are quitted? if they be born free; I agree to it; but then they were never charg'd with it, so far as to make them *liable to damnation*. If they be not born free, when are they quitted? By baptisme, before, or after? He that saies *before* or *after*, must speak wholly by chance and without pretence of Scripture or tradition, or any sufficient warrant; and he cannot guesse when it is. If in Baptisme he is quitted, then he that dies before baptisme, is still under the sentence, and what shall become of him? If it be answered, that God will pardon him, some way or other, at some time or other; I reply, yea, but who said so? For if the Scriptures have said that we are all in *Adam* guilty of sin and damnation, and the Scriptures have told us no wayes of being quit of it, but by baptisme, and faith in Christ; Is it not plainly consequent



## Divine Attributes. 63

sequent that til we believe in Christ, or at least till in the faith of others, we are Baptised into Christ, we are reckoned still in *Adam*, not in Christ, that is, still we are under damnation, and not heires of heaven but of wrath onely?

5. How can any one bring himself into a belief that none can be damned for Original sin, if ~~it~~ be of this perswasion that it makes us liable to damnation; for if you say as I say, that it is against Gods justice to damn us for the fault of another, then it is also against his justice to sentence us to that suffering which to inflict is injustice. If you say it is beleevved upon this account, because Christ was promised to all mankinde, I reply, that yet all mankinde shall not be saved; and there are conditions required on our part, and no man can be saved but by Christ, and he must come

come to him or be brought to him, or it is not told us, how any one can have a part in him; and therefore that will not give us the confidence is looked for. If it be at last said that we hope in Gods goodness that he will take care of innocents, and that they shall not perish, I answer, that if they be innocents, we need not appeal to his goodnesse, for, his *justice* will secure them. If they be guilty and not innocents, then it is but vain to run to Gods goodnesse, which in this particular is not revealed; when it is against his justice which is revealed; and to hope God will save them whom he hates, who are gone from him in *Adam*, who are born heires of his wrath, slaves of the Devil, servants of sin (for these Epithetes are given to all the children of *Adam*)

*the Divine Attributes.* 65

*Adam*, by the opponents in this Question) is to hope for that against which his justice visibly is engaged, and for which I hope there is no ground, unlesse this instance of Divine goodnesse were expressed in revelation; For so even wicked persons on their death-bed are bidden to hope without rule and without reason or sufficient grounds of trust. But besides; that we hope in Gods goodnesse in this case is not ill, but I ask, is it against Gods goodnesse that any one should perish for Original sin? if it be against Gods goodnesse, it is also against his justice; for nothing is just that is not also good. Gods goodnesse may cause his justice to forbear a sentence, but whatsoever is against Gods goodnesse, is against God

99 *A Vindication of the*

God, and therefore against his justice also; because every attribute in God is God himself: For it is one thing to say [This is against Gods goodnesse] and the contrary is agreeable to Gods goodnesse] Whatsoever is against the goodnesse of God is essentially evil: But a thing may be agreeable to Gods goodnesse, and yet the other part not be against it. For example; It is against the goodnesse of God to hate fools and ideots: and therefore he can never hate them. But it is agreeable to Gods goodnesse to give heaven to them and the joyes beatifical: and if he does not give them so much, yet if he does no evil to them hereafter, it is also agreeable to his goodnesse: To give them Heaven, or not to give them Heaven, though they be contradictories; yet are both agreeable to his goodnesse. But in contraries the

the case is otherwise: For though not to give them heaven is consistent with the Divine goodnesse, yet to send them to hell is not. The reason of the difference is this. Because to do contrary things must come from contrary principles; and whatsoever is contrary to the Divine goodnesse is essentially evil. But to do or not to do, supposes but one positive principle; and the other negative, not having a contrary cause, may be wholly innocent as proceeding from a negative: but to speak more plain, Is it against Gods goodnesse that Infants should be damned for Original sin? then it could never have been done, it was essentially evil, and therefore could never have been decreed or sentenced. But if it be not against Gods goodness that they should perish in hell, then it may consist with Gods goodness; and then

then to hope that Gods goodness will rescue them from his justice, when the thing may agree with both, is to hope without ground; God may be good, though they perish for *Adams* sin; and if so, and that he can be just too: upon the account, of what attribute *shall* these innocents be rescued; and we hope for mercy for them.

6. If *Adams* posterity be onely liable to damnation, but *shall* never be damned for *Adams* sin, then all the children of Heathens dying in their infancy, *shall* escape as well as baptized Christian children: which if any of my disagreeing Brethren *shall* affirm, he will indeed seem to magnifie Gods goodness, but he must fall out with some great Doctors of the Church whom he would pretend to follow; and besides, he will be hard put to it, to tell what advantage  
Christian

*the Divine Attributes.* 69

Christian children have over Heathens, supposing them all to die young; for being bred up in the Christian Religion is accidental, and may happen to the children of unbelievers, or may not happen to the children of believers; and if Baptisme addes nothing to their present state, there is no reason infants should be baptized; but if it does add to their present capacity (as most certainly it does very much) then that Heathen infants, should be in a condition of being rescued from the wrath of God, as well as Christian Infants, is a strange unlookt for affirmative, and can no way be justified or made probable, but by affirming it to be against the justice of God to condemn any for *Adams* sin. Indeed if it be unjust (as I have proved it is) then it will follow, that none shall suffer damnation by it. But if  
the

70 *A Vindication of the*

the hopes of the salvation of Heathen infants be to be derived onely from Gods goodnesse, though Gods goodnesse cannot fail, yet our argument may fail; for it will not follow, because God is good, therefore Heathen infants shall be saved: for it might as well follow, God is good, therefore Heathens shall be no heathens, but all turn Christians. These things do not follow affirmatively. But negatively they do. For if it were against Gods Goodnesse that they should be reckoned in *Adam* unto eternal death, then it is also against his Justice, and against God all the way; and then, either we should finde some revelation of Gods honour in Scripture, or at least, there would be no principle (such as is this pretence of being guilty of damnation in *Adam*) to contest against it.

7 But



7. But to come yet closer to the Question, some Good Men and wise suppose, that the *Sublapsarian* Presbyterians can be confuted in their pretended grounds of absolute reprobation, although we grant that *Adams* sinne is damnable to his posterity, provided we say, that though it was damnable, yet it shall never damne us. Now though I wish it could be done, that they and I might not differ so much as in a circumstance, yet *first* it is certain that the men they speake of can never be confuted upon the stock of Gods Justice, because as the one saies, it is just that God should actually damn all for the sin of *Adam*: So the other saies, it is just that God should actually sentence all to damnation; and so there the case is equal: *Secondly*, they cannot be confuted upon the stock of Gods goodnesse; because the emanations of that being wholly

D. ly

## 72 *A Vindication of the*

ly arbitrary, and though there are negative measures of it, as there is of Gods Infinity, and we know Gods goodness to be inconsistent with some things, yet there are no positive measures of this goodnesse; and no man can tell how much it will do for us: and therefore without a revelation, things may be sometimes hoped, which yet may not be presumed; and therefore here also they are not to be confuted: and as for the particular Scriptures, unlesse we have the advantage of essentiall reason taken from the divine Attributes, they will oppose Scripture to Scripture, and have as much advantage to expound the opposite places, as the *Jewes* have in their Questions of the *Messias*; and therefore *si meos ipse corymbos necterem*, if I might make mine own arguments in their society, and with their leave; I would upon that very account suspect

## *Divine Attributes.* 73

spect the usuall discourses of the effects and Oeconomy of Originall sinne.

8. For where will they reckon the beginning of Predestination? will they reckon it in *Adam* after the fall, or in Christ immediately promised? If in *Adam*, then they return to the Presbyterian way, and run upon all the rocks before reckoned, enough to break all the World in Pieces. If in Christ they reckon it (and so they do) then thus I argue. If we are all reckoned in Christ before we were borne, then how can we be reckoned in *Adam* when we are born I speak as to the matter of Predestination to salvation, or damnation; For as for the intermedial temporal evils, and dangers spirituall, and sad infirmities, they are our nature, and might with Justice have

D 2

been

74 *A Vindication of*

been all the portion God had given to *Adam*, and therefore may be so to us, and consequently not at all to be reckoned in this inquiry : But certainly, as to the maine.

9. If God lookes upon us all in Christ, then by him we are rescued from *Adam*; so much is done for us before we were born. For if this is not to be reckoned till after we were borne, then *Adam's* sin prevailed really in some periods, and to some effects for which God in Christ had provided no remedie : for it gave no remedie to children till after they were born, but irremediably they were born children of wrath ; For if a remedy were given to children before they were born, then they are born in Christ not in *Adam*; but if this remedy was not given to children before they were born, then it followes, that we were not at first looked upon

upon in Christ, but in *Adam*, and consequently he was *caput prædestinationis* the head of predestination, or else there were two; the one before we were born, the other after. So that *hæret lethalis arundo*: The arrow sticks fast and it cannot be pulled out, unlesse by other instruments then are commonly in fashion. However it be, yet me thinks this a very good probable argument.

As *Adam* sinned before any childe was born, so was Christ promised before; and that our Redeemer shall not have more force upon children, that they should be born beloved and quitted from wrath, then *Adam* our Progenitor shall have to cause that we be born hated and in a damnable condition, wants so many degrees of probability, that it seems to dishonour the mercy of God, and the reputa-

76 *A Vindication of the*

tion of his goodesse and the power of his redemption.

For this serves as an Antidote, and Antinomy of their great objection pretended by these learned persons: for whereas they say, they the rather affirm this, because it is an honour to the redemption which our Saviour wrought for us, that it rescued us from the sentence of damnation, which we had incurred. To this I say, that the honour of our blessed Saviour does no way depend upon our imaginations and weak propositions: and neither can the reputation and honour of the Divine goodnesse borrow aids and artificial supports from the dishonour of his Justice; and it is no reputation to a Physitian to say he hath cured us of an evil which we never had; and shall we accuse the Father of mercies to have wounded us for no other reason.

## *the Divine Attributes. 77*

son but that the son may have the Honour to have cured us? I understand not that. He that makes a necessity that he may finde a remedie, is like the *Roman* whom *Cato* found fault withal; he would commit a fault that he might begge a pardon; he had rather write bad Greek, that he might make an apologie, then write good latine, and need none. But however; Christ hath done enough for us; even all that we did need, and since it is all the reason in the World we should pay him all honour; we may remember, that it is a greater favour to us that by the benefit of our Blessed Saviour, who was the Lamb slain from the beginning of the world, we were reckoned in Christ, and born in the accounts of the Divine favour; I say, it is a greater favour that we were born under the redemption of Christ, then under  
the

the sentence and damnation of *Adam*; and to prevent an evil is a greater favour then to cure it; so that if to do honour to Gods goodnesse and to the graces of our Redeemer, we will suppose a need, we may do him more honour to suppose that the promised seed of the woman did do us as early a good, as the sin of *Adam* could do us mischief; and therefore that in Christ we are born, quitted from any such supposed sentence, and not that we bring it upon our shoulders into the World with us. But this thing relies onely upon their suppositions,

For if we will speak of what is really true and plainly revealed: From all the sins of all mankind Christ came to redeem us: He came to give us a supernatural birth: to tell us all his Fathers will; to reveal to us those glorious



*the Divine Attributes.* 79

rious promises upon the expectation of which we might be enabled to do every thing that is required; He came to bring us grace, and life, and spirit; to strengthen us against all the powers of Hell and Earth; to sanctifie our afflictions, which from *Adam* by Natural generation descended on us; to take out the sting of death, to make it an entrance to immortal life; to assure us of resurrection, to intercede for us, and to be an advocate for us, when we by infirmity commit sin; to pardon us when we repent. Nothing of which could be derived to us from *Adam* by our natural generation; Mankind now, taking in his whole constitution, and designe, is like the Birds of *Paradise* which travellers tell us of in the *Molucco Islands*; born without legs; but by a celestial power they have a recompence.

D 5

pence made to them for that defect; and they alwayes hover in the air, and feed on the dew of heaven: so are we birds of *Paradise*; but cast out from thence, and born without legs, without strength to walk in the laws of God, or to go to heaven; but by a power from above, we are adopted in our new birth to a celestial conversation, we feed on the dew of heaven, *the just does live by faith*, and breaths in this new life by the spirit of God. For from the first *Adam* nothing descended to us but an infirm body, and a naked soul, evil example and a body of death, ignorance and passion, hard labor and a cursed field, a captive soul and an imprisoned body, that is, a soul naturally apt to comply with the appetites of the body, and its desires whether reasonable or excessive: and though these things were not direct

*the Divine Attributes.* 81

direct sins to us in their natural abode and first principle, yet there are proper inherent miseries and principles of sin to us in their emanation. But from this state, Christ came to redeem us all by his grace, and by his spirit, by his life and by his death, by his Doctrine and by his Sacraments, by his promises and by his revelations, by his resurrection and by his ascension, by his interceding for us and judging of us; and if this be not a conjugation of glorious things great enough to amaze us, and to merit from us all our services, and all our love, and all the glorifications of God, I am sure nothing can be added to it by any supposed need of which we have no revelation: There is as much done for us as we could need, and more then we could aske,

*Nempe*

*Nempe quod optanti Divûm promit-  
tere nemo*

*Auderet,volvenda dies en attulit  
ultra!*

*Vivite felices animæ quibus est for-  
tuna peracta.*

*Jam sua*——the meaning of  
which words I render, or at least  
recompence with the verse of a  
Psalm.

*Psal. 56.  
by Bp.  
King.*

*To thee O Lord I'll pay my  
vow*

*My knees in thanks to thee  
shall bow,*

*For thou my life keepst from  
the grave*

*And do'st my feet from fal-  
ling save,*

*That with the living in thy  
sight*

*I may enjoy eternal light.*

*For*

*the Divine Attributes.* 83

For thus what *Abasuerus* said to *Ester*, *Veteres literas muta, change the old letters*; is done by the birth of our Blessed Saviour. *Eva* is changed into *Ave*, and although it be true what *Bensirach* said, *From the woman is the beginning of sin, and by her we all die*, yet it is now chang'd by the birth of our Redeemer, from a woman is the beginning of our restitution, and in him we all live; thus are all the four quarters of the World renewed by the second *Adam*: 'Ανατολή, Δύσις, Ἀρχὸς, Μεσημβρία, *The East, west, North, and South*, are represented in the second *Adam* as well as the first, and rather, and to better purposes, because if sin did abound, Grace shall superabound.

I have now Madam given to your honour such accounts, as I hope being added to my other papers, may satisfy not onely your Ladyship, but those

## 84. *A Vindication of*

those to whom this account may be communicated. I shall onely now beg your patience, since your Honour hath been troubled with Questions, and inquiries, and objections, and little murmurs to hear my answers to such of them as have been brought to me.

1. I am complained of, that I would trouble the World with a new thing; which let it be never so true, yet unlesse it were very useful, will hardly make recompence for the trouble I put the world to, in this inquiry.

I answer; that for the newnesse of it; I have already given accounts that the opinions which I impugne, as they are no direct parts of the article of Original sin, so they are newer then the truth which I have asserted. But let what I say seem as new as the reformation did, when *Luther* first preached against indulgences;

*the Divine Attributes.* 85

gences, the presence of Novelty did not, and we say, ought not to have affrighted him; and therefore I ought also to look to what I say, that it be true, and the truth will proove its age. But to speak freely Madam, though I have a great reverence for Antiquity, yet it is the prime antiquity of the Church; the ages of Martyrs and Holinesse, that I mean; and I am sure that in them, my opinion hath much more warrant then the contrary; But for the descending ages I give that veneration to the great names of them that went before us, which themselves gave to their Predecessors; I honour their memory, I read their books, I imitate their piety, I examine their arguments; for therefore they did write them, and where the reasons of the Moderns and their's seeme equall, I turn the ballance on the  
the

the elder side, and follow them; but where a scruple or a grane of reason is evidently in the other ballance; I must follow that. *Nempe qui ante nos ista moverunt, non Domini nostri, sed Duces sunt. Seneca. ep. 33.* They that taught of this Article before me, are Good Guides, but no Lords and Masters; for I must acknowledge none upon earth: for so am I commanded by my Master that is in Heaven; and I remember what we are taught in *Palingenius*, when wee were boyes.

*Quicquid Aristoteles, vel quivis dicat eorum,*

*Dicta nihil moror à vero cum foris recedunt:*

*Sæpe graves magnosq; viros, famaq; verendos*

*Errare & labi contingit, plurima secum  
Ingenia in tenebras consueti nominis  
alti,*

*Authores ubi connivent deducere easdem.*

If



*the Divine Attributes.* 87

If *Aristotle* be deceiv'd , and say  
that's true,  
What nor himself , nor others ever  
knew,  
I leave his text, and let his Schollers  
talke  
Till they be hoarse or weary in  
their walke:  
When wise men erre , though their  
fame ring like Bells,  
I scape a danger when I leave their  
spells.

For although they that are dead  
some ages before we were borne,  
have a reverence due to them , yet  
more is due to truth that shall ne-  
ver die: and God is not wanting to  
our industry any more then to  
theirs; but blesses every age with  
the understanding of his truths. *Æta-  
tibus omnibus, omnibus hominibus com-  
munis sapientia est, nec illam cen pecu-  
lium licet antiquitati gratulari.* All  
ages

88 *A Vindication of the*

ages, and all men have their advantages in their inquiries after truth; neither is wisdom appropriate to our Fathers. And because even wise men may be deceived, and therefore that when I find it, or suppose it so (for that's all one as to me and my dutie) I must go after truth where ever it is; certainly it will be lesse expected from me to follow the popular noises and the voices of the people, who are not to teach us, but to be taught by us: and I believe myself to have reason to complain when men are angry at a doctrine because it is not commonly taught; that is, when they are impatient to be taught a truth, because most men do already believe a lie; *recti apud nos locum tenet error ubi publicus factus est*, So Seneca (*Epist.* 123.) complained in his time: it is a strange title to truth which error can pretend, for its being publick; and we refuse to follow

Follow an unusuall truth ; *quasi honestius sit quia frequentius*, and indeed it were well to do so in those propositions who have no truth in them but what they borrow from mens opinions, and are for nothing tolerable, but that they are usuall.

*Object.* 2. But what necessity is there in my publication of this doctrine, supposing it were true ; for all truths are not to be spoken at all times ; and if a truth gives offence, it is better to let men alone, then to disturb the peace.

I answer with the labouring mans Proverb ; a pennyworth of ease is worth a Penny at any time ; and a little truth is worth a little Peace, every day of the weeke : & *ceteris paribus*, Truth is to be preferred before Peace ; not every trifling truth to a considerable peace : but if the truth be material, it makes recompence, though it brings a great noise along with.

with it; and if the breach of Peace be nothing but that men talke in Private, or declame a little in publicke; truly then (Madam) it is a very pittifull little proposition, the discovery of which in truth will not make recompence for the prating of disagreeing Persons. Truth and Peace make an excellent yoke; but the *truth of God* is alwayes to be preferred before the *Peace of men*; and therefore our Blessed Saviour came *not to send Peace, but a sword*; That is, he knew his doctrine would cause great devisions of heart: ~~but yet he~~ <sup>came</sup> to perswade us to Peace and Unity. Indced if the truth be cleare, and yet of no great effect in the lives of men, in government, or in the honour of God, then it ought not to break the Peace; That is, it may not run out of its retirement, to disquiet them, to whom their rest is better then that knowledge, But if  
it

it be brought out already, it must not be deserted positively, though peace goes away in its stead. So that peace is rather to be *deserted*, than any truth should be *renounced* or *denied*; but Peace is rather to be *procured* or *continued*, then some truth offer'd. This is my sence (Madam) when the case is otherwise then I suppose it to be at present. For as for the present case, there must be two when there is a falling out, or a peace broken; and therefore I will secure it now; for let any man dissent from me in this Article, I will not be troubled at him; he may doe it with liberty, and with my charity. If any man is of my opinion, I confesse I love him the better; but if he refutes it, I will not love him lesse after then I did before: but he that dissents, and reviles me, must expect from me no other kindness but that I forgive him, and pray for him,  
and

92 *A Vindication of the*

and offer to reclaim him, and that I resolve nothing shall ever make me either hate him, or reproach him: and that still in the greatest of his difference, I refuse not to give him the communion of a Brother; I believe I shall be chidden by some or other for my easinesse, and want of fierceness, which they call Zeal, but it is a fault of my nature; a part of my Original sin:

*Vnicuiqꝫ dedit vitium Natura  
Creato,*

*Mi Natura aliquid semper amare  
dedit. Propert.*

Some weaknesse to each man by  
birth descends,  
To me too great a kindnesse Nature  
lends.

But if the Peace can be broken no  
more then thus; I suppose the truth  
which

which I publish will do more then make recompence for the noise that in Clubs and Conventicles is made over and above. So long as I am thus resolved; there may be injury done to me, but there can be no duell, or losse of Peace abroad. For a single anger, or a displeasure on one side, is not a breach of peace on both; and a Warre cannot be made by fewer, then a bargain can; in which alwaies there must be two at least.

*Object.* 3. But as to the thing; If it be inquired *τις λόγος εις διχοδομίαν χρείας*; what profit, what use, what edification is there, what good to souls, what honour to God by this new explication of the Article? I answer; that the usuall Doctrines of Originall sinne are made the great foundation of the horrible proposition concerning absolute Reprobation; the consequences of it reproach God with injustice, they

they charge God foolishly, and deny his Goodness and his Wisdom in many instances: and whatsoever can upon the account of the Divine Attributes be objected against the fierce way of Absolute Decrees; all that can be brought for the reproof of their usuall Propositions concerning Originall sinne. For the consequences are plaine; and by them the necessity of my Doctrine, and its usefulnessse may be understood.

For 1. If God decrees us to be born sinners; Then he makes us to be sinners: and then where is his goodnesse?

2. If God does damne any for that, he damnes us for what we could not help, and for what himself did, and then where is his Justice?

3. If God sentence us to that Damnation, which he cannot in justice inflict, where is his Wisdom?

4. If



*the Divine Attributes.* 95

4. If God for the sinne of *Adam* brings upon us a necessity of sinning; where is our liberty? where is our Nature? what is become of all Lawes, and of all Vertue and vice? How can men be distinguish'd from Beasts: or the Vertuous from the vitious?

5. If by the fall of *Adam*, we are so wholly ruined in our faculties, that we cannot do any good, but must do evill; how shall any man take care of his wayes? or how can it be supposed he should strive against all vice, when he can excuse so much upon his Nature? or indeed how shall he strive at all? for if all actual sins are derived from the Originall, and then is unavoidable, and yet an Unresistable cause, then no man can take care to avoid any actual sinne, whose cause is naturall, and not to be declined. And then where is his providence and Government?

E

6. If

## 26 *A Vindication of the*

6. If God does cast Infants into Hell for the sinne of others, and yet did not condemne Devills, but for their owne sinne; where is his love to mankind?

7. If God chooseth the death of so many Millions of Persons who are no sinners upon their own stock, and yet sweares that he does not love the death of a sinner, *viz.* sinning with his owne choice; how can that be credible, he should love to kill Innocents, and yet should love to spare the Criminall? where then is his Mercie, and where is his Truth?

8. If God hath given us a Nature by derivation, which is wholly corrupted, then how can it be that all which God made is good? for though *Adam* corrupted himself, yet in propriety of speaking, we did not; but this was the Decree of God; and then where is the excellency of his

his providence and Power, where is the glory of the Creation?

Because therefore that God is all *goodness*, and *justice*, and *wisdom*, and *love*, and that he governs all things, and all men wisely and holily, and according to the capacities of their natures and Persons; that he gives us a wise law, and binds that law on us by promises and threatnings; I had reason to assert these glories of the Divine Majestie, and remove the hindrances of a good life; since every thing can hinder us from living well, but scarcely can all the Arguments of God and man, and all the Powers of heaven and hell perswade us to strictnesse and severity.

*Qui serere ingenuum volet a-*  
*grum,*

*Liberet arva prius fœtibus*

98 *A Vindication of*

*Falce rubos, silicemq; resecet,* Boeth.  
*Ut novâ fruge gravis Ceres eat.* lib.3.  
 Metr.1.

He that will sow his field with  
 hopefull seed,  
 Must every bramble, every thi-  
 stle weed:  
 And when each hindrance to the  
 graine is gone,  
 A fruitfull crop shall rise of corn  
 alone,

When therefore there were so  
 many wayes made to the Devill, I  
 was willing amongst many others  
 to stop this also; and I dare say, few  
 Questions in Christendome can say  
 half so much in justification of their  
 owne usefulness and necessity.

I know (Madam) that they  
 who are of the other side doe and  
 will disavow most of these conse-  
 quences; and so doe all the World,  
 all

all the evils which their adversaries say, do follow from their opinions ; but yet all the World of men that perceive such evils to follow from a proposition , think themselves bound to stop the progression of such opinions from whence they believe such evils may arise. If the Church of *Rome* did believe that all those horrid things were chargeable upon Transubstantiation, and upon worshipping of Images , which we charge upon the Doctrines , I doe not doubt but they would as much disowne the Proposition , as now they doe the consequents; and yet I doe as little doubt but that we do well to disown the first, because we espy the latter : and though the Man be not, yet the doctrines are highly chargeable with the evils that follow it may be the men espy them not; yet from the doctrines they do certainly follow ; and there are not it

the World many men who owne that is evil in the pretence, but many doe such as are dangerous in the effect; and this doctrine which I have reprov'd, I take to be one of them.

*Object. 4.* But if Originall sinne be not a sinne properly, why are children baptized? and what benefit comes to them by baptism?

I Answer, as much as they need, and are capable of: and it may as well be asked, Why were all the sons of *Abraham* circumcised, when in that Covenant there was no remission of sins at all; for little things and legal impurities, and irregularities there were; but there being no sacrifice there but of beasts, whose blood could not take away sinne, it is certaine and plainly taught us in Scripture, that no Rite of *Moses* was expiatory of sinnes. But secondly. This Objection can presse nothing at all; for why was  
Christ

*the Divine Attributes.* 101

Christ baptized, who knew no sinne?  
But yet so it behoved him to fulfill  
all Righteousnesse. 3. Baptisme is  
called *regeneration*, or the *new birth*;  
and therefore, since in *Adam*  
Children are borne onely to a natu-  
rall life and a Naturall death, and by  
this they can never arrive at Hea-  
ven, therefore Infants are baptized,  
because untill they be borne anew,  
they can never have title to the Pro-  
mises of Jesus Christ, or be heirs of  
heaven, and coheirs of Jesus. 4. By  
Baptisme Children are made parta-  
kers of the holy Ghost, and of the  
grace of God; which I desire to be  
observed in opposition to the *Pela-*  
*gian* Heresy, who did suppose Na-  
ture to be so perfect, that the Grace  
of God was not necessary, and that  
by Nature alone, they could go to  
heaven; which because I affirm to  
be impossible, and that Baptisme is  
therefore necessary, because nature is  
insuf-

insufficient, and Baptisme is the great chanel of grace; there ought to be no envious and ignorant load laid upon my Doctrine, as if it complied with the *Pelagian*, against which it is so essentially and so mainly opposed in the main difference of his Doctrine. 5. Children are therefore Baptized, because if they live they will sinne, and though their sins are not pardoned before hand, yet in Baptisme they are admitted to that state of favour, that they are within the Covenant of repentance and Pardon: and this is expressly the Doctrine of St. *Austin*, lib. 1. *de nupt. & concup.* cap. 26. & cap. 33. & *tract.* 124. in *Johan.* But of this I have already given larger accounts in my Discourse of Baptisme. *part.* 2. *p.* 194. in the great Exemplar. 6. Children are baptized for the Pardon even of Originall sin; this may be affirmed *truly*, but yet  
*im.*



*improperly* : for so far as it is imputed, so farr also it is remissible ; for the evill that is done by *Adam*, is also taken away in Christ ; and it is imputed to us to very evill purposes, as I have already explicated : but as it was among the *Jewes* who believed then the sinne to be taken away, when the evill of punishment is taken off ; so is Originall sinne taken away in Baptisme ; for though the Material part of the evill , is not taken away , yet the curse in all the sons of God is turn'd into a blessing, and is made an occasion of reward, or an entrance to it. Now in all this I affirme all that is true , and all that is probable ; for in the same sense, as Originall staine is a sinne ; so does Baptisme bring the Pardon. It is a sinne metonymically, that is, because it is the effect of one sinne , and the cause of many ; and just so in baptism it is taken away, that it is now

the matter of a grace, and the opportunity of glory; and upon these Accounts the Church Baptizes all her Children.

*Object.* 5. But to deny Originall sinne to be a sinne properly and inherently, is expressly against the words of *S. Paul* in the 5. Chapter to the *Romans*, *If it bee, I have done; but that it is not, I have these things to say.* 1. If the words be capable of any interpretation, and can be permitted to signifie otherwise then is vulgarly pretended, I suppose myself to have given reasons sufficient, why they ought to be. For any interpretation that does violence to right Reason, to Religion, to Holinesse of life, and the Divine Attributes of God, is therefore to be rejected; and another chosen; For in all Scriptures, all good and all wise men doe it.

2. The words in question [*sin*] and

*the Divine Attributes.* 105

and [*sinner*] and [*condemnation*] are frequently used in Scripture in the lesser sense, and [*sin*] is taken for the punishment of *sin*; and [*sin*] is taken for him who bore the evil of the *sinne*, and [*sin*] is taken for legal impurity; and for him who could not be guilty, even for Christ himself; as I have proved already: and in the like manner [*sinners*] is used, by the rule of Conjugates and denominatives; but it is so also in the case, of Bathsheba the Mother of Solomon. 3. For the word [*condemnation*], it is by the Apostle himself limited to signify his temporal death; for when the Apostle sayes *Death passed upon all men, in as much as all men have sinned*; he must mean *temporal death*; for eternal death did not passe upon all  
men.

men; and if he means *eternal death* he must not mean that it came for *Adams sin*; but *in as much as all men have sinned*, that is, upon all those upon whom eternal death did come, it came because they also have sinned. 4. The Apostle here speaks of sin *imputed*; therefore not of sin *inherent*: and if imputed onely to such purposes as he here speaks of, *viz.* to temporal death, then it is neither a sin properly, nor yet imputable to Eternal death so far as is or can be inplyed by the Apostles words. 5. The Apostles sayes; *by the disobedience of one many were made sinners*: so that it appears that we in this have no sin of our own, neither is it at all our own *formally* and *inherently*; for though efficiently it was his, and effectively ours as to certain purposes of imputation; yet it could not be a sin to us *formally*; because  
it

it was *Vnius inobedientia*, the disobedience of one man, therefore in no sense, could it be *properly* ours.

6. Whensoever another mans sin is imputed to his relative, therefore because it is anothers and imputed, it can go no further but to effect certain evils to afflict the relative, but to punish the cause; not formally to denominate the descendant or relative to be a sinner; for it is as much a contradiction to say that I am formally by him a sinner, as that I did really do his action. Now [*to impute*] in Scripture, it signifies to reckon as if he had done it; *Not to impute* is to treat him so as if he had not done it. So far then as the imputation is, so far we are reckoned as sinners; but *Adams* sin being by the Apostle signified to be imputed but to the condemnation or sentence to a temporal.

poral death; so far we are sinners in him, that is, so as that for his sake death was brought upon us; And indeed the word [*imputare*] to impute] does never signifie more, nor alwayes so much. *Imputare* verò frequenter ad significationem exprobrantis accedit, sed citra reprehensionem, sayes *Laurentius valla*; It is like an exprobatation, but short of a reproof; so *Quintilian*. *Imputas nobis propitios ventos, & secundum mare, ac civitatis opulentæ liberalitatem*. Thou doest impute, that is, upbraid to us our prosperous voyages, and a calm Sea, and the liberality of a rich City. *Imputare* signifies oftentimes the same that *computare*; to reckon or account: *Nam hæc in quartâ non imputantur*, say the Lawyers, they are not imputed, that is, they are not computed or reckoned. Thus *Adams* sin is imputed to us, that is, it is put into our

reckoning, & when we are sick and die, we pay our Symbols, the portion of evil that is laid upon us: and what *Marcus* said, I may say in this case with a little variety *legata in hereditate---sive legatum datum sit heredi, sive percipere, sive deducere vel retinere passus est, ei imputantur*: the the legacy whether it be given or left to the heire, whether he may take it or keep it, is still imputed to him ; that is, *it is within his reckoning*.

But no reason, no Scripture, no Religion does inforce ; and no divine Attribute does permit that we should say that God did so impute *Adams* sin to his posterity, that he di really esteem them to be guilty of *Adams* sin ; equally culpable, equally hateful ; For if in this sense it be true that in him we sinned ; then we sinn'd as he did, that is, with the same malice, in the same action ;

on; and then we are as much guilty as he; but if we have sinned lesse, then we did not *sin in him*; for to sinne in him, could not by him be lessen'd to us; for what we did in him we did by him, and therefore as much as he did; but if God imputed this sin lesse to us then to him, then this imputation supposes it onely to be a collateral and indirect account to such purposes as he pleased: of which purposes we judge by the analogy of faith, by the words of Scripture, by the proportion and notices of the Divine Attributes. 7. There is nothing in the designe or purpose of the Apostle that can or ought to infer any other thing; for his purpose is to signifie that by mans sin death entred into the world; which the son of *Sirach Eccles. 25. 33.* expresses thus; *à muliere factum est initium peccati, & inde est quod morimur;*  
from



*the Divine Attributes.* 111

from the woman is the beginning of sinne; and from her it is that we all die: and again, *Ecclus. 1. 24.* by the envie of the Devil death came into the world; this evil being Universal, Christ came to the world, and became our head, to other purposes, even to redeem us from death; which he hath begun and will finish, and to become to us our Parent in a new birth, the Author of a spiritual life; and this benefit is of far more efficacy by Christ, then the evil could be by *Adam*; and as by *Adam* we are made sinners: so by Christ we are made righteous; not just so; but so and more, and therefore as our being made sinners, signifies that by him we die, so being by Christ made righteous must at least signifie that by him we live: and this is so evident to them who read Saint *Paul's* words.

*Rom. 5.*

112 *A Vindication of the*

*Rom. 5.* from verse 12. to verse 19. inclusively, that I wonder any man should make a farther question concerning them; especially since *Erasmus* and *Grotius* who are to be reckoned amongst the greatest, and the best expositors of Scripture, that any age since the Apostles and their immediat successors hath brought forth, have so understood and rendred it. But Madam, that your Honour may read the words and their sense together, and see that without violence they signifie what I have said, and no more; I have here subjoyned a paraphrase of them; in which if I use any violence I can very easily be reproved.

*Rom.*

*Rom. 5. 12. As  
by one man sinne  
entred into the  
world, and Death  
by sin : and so  
death passed upon  
all men, for that  
all have sinned.*

As by the disobedience of *Adam*, sin had it's beginning; and by sin death, that is, the sentence and preparati-  
ons, the solenni-  
ties & addreses  
of death, sicknesse, calamity, dimi-  
nution of strengths, Old age, mis-  
fortunes, and all the affections of  
Mortality, for the destroying of  
our temporall life; and so this mor-  
tality, and condition or state of  
death pass'd actually upon all man-  
kind; for *Adam* being thrown out of  
paradise, and forc'd to live with his  
Children where they had no trees  
of Life, as he had in Paradise, was  
remanded to his mortall, naturall  
state; and therefore death passed up-  
on them, mortally seized on all; *for  
that all have sinned*; that is, the sin  
was

was reckoned to all, not to make them guilty like *Adam*; but *Adams* sinne passed upon all, imprinting this real calamity on us all: But yet death descended also upon *Adams* Posterity for their own sins; for since all did sinne, all should die.

13. For untill the law, sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed where there is no law. And marvel not that Death did presently descend on all mankind, e-

ven before a Law was given them with an appendant penalty, viz. With the expresse intermination of death; For they did do actions unnaturall and vile enough, but yet these things which afterwards upon the publication of the Law were imputed to them upon their personall account, even unto death, were not yet so imputed. For Nature alone gives

*the Divine Attributes.* 115

gives Rules, but does not directly bind to penalties. But death came upon them before the Law for *Adams* sin; for with him God being angry, was pleased to curse him also in his Posterity, and leave them also in their mere naturall condition, to which yet they dispos'd themselves, and had deserved but too much by committing evill things; to which things, although before the law, death was not threatned, yet for the anger which God had against mankind, he left that death which he threatned to *Adam expressly*, by *implication*, to fall upon the Posterity.

14. Never-

## 116 *A Vindication of the*

14. *Neverthe-  
lesse death reign-  
ed from Adam to  
Moses, even over  
them that had not  
sinned after the si-  
militude of A-  
dam's transgres-  
sion, who is the  
figure of him  
which was to  
come.*

And therefore  
it was that death  
reigned from A-  
dam to Moses,  
from the first  
law to the se-  
cond; from the  
time that a Law  
was given to one  
man, till the time  
a Law was given  
to one nation; and  
although men

had not sinn'd so grievously as A-  
dam did, who had no excuse, many  
helps, excellent endowments, migh-  
ty advantages, trifling temptations,  
communication with God himself,  
no disorder in his faculties, free will,  
perfect immunity from violence,  
Originall righteousness, perfect po-  
wer over his faculties; yet those  
men, such as *Abel*, and *Seth*, *Noah*, and  
*Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, *Joseph*, and  
*Benja-*

## Divine Attributes. 117

*Benjamin*, who sinned lesse, and in the midst of all their disadvantages, were left to fall under the same sentence; and this, besides that it was the present Oeconomy of the Divine Providence and Government, it did also like *Janus* looke  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\omega$  καὶ ἐπίσσω, it looked forwards as well as backwards, and became a type of Christ, or of him that was to come. For as from *Adam* evill did descend upon his naturall Children, upon the account of Gods entrance with *Adam*; so did good descend upon the spirituall Children of the second *Adam*.

85. But

# 118 *A Vindication of*

15. *But not as the offence, so also is the free gift: for if through the offence of one many be dead much more the grace of God, & the gift by grace, which is by one man Jesus Christ hath abounded unto many.* ) This should have been the latter part of a similitude, but upon further consideration, it is found, that as in *Adam* we die, so in *Christ* we live, and much rather, and much more, therefore I cannot say, *As by one man* [ vers. 12. ] *so by one man* [ verse 15. ] *But much more*; for not as the offence, so also is the free gift, for the offence of one did run over unto many, and those many, even as it were all, all except *Enoch*, or some very few more of whom mention peradventure is not made, are already dead upon that account, but when God comes by *Jesus Christ* to shew mercy to mankind, he does



does it in much more abundance; he may be angry to the third and fourth generation, in them that hate him, but he will shew mercy unto thousands in them that love him; to a thousand generations, and and in ten thousand degrees; so that now although a comparison proportionate was at first intended, yet the river here rises far higher then the fountain; and now no argument can be drawn from the similitude of *Adam* and Christ, but that as much hurt was done to humane nature by *Adams* sin, so very much more good is done to mankind by the incarnation of the Son of God.

F

16. And

16. *And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift; for the judgement was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification* } And the first disparity and exccesse is in this particular: for the judgement was δι' ἐν ᾧ ἀμαρτήσαντι ᾧ, & ἐξ ἐν ᾧ παραπτώματι ᾧ, by one man sinning one sin; that one sin was imputed; but by Christ, not onely one sin was forgiven freely, but many offences were remitted unto justification; and secondly, a vast disparity there is in this; that the descendants from *Adam* were perfectly like him in nature, his own real natural production, and they sinned (though not so bad) yet very much, and therefore there was a great parity of reason that the evil which was threatened to *Adam*, and not to his children

children should yet for the likeness of nature and of sin descend upon them. But in the other part the case is highly differing; for Christ being our Patriarch in a spiritual birth, we fall infinitely short of him, and are not so like him as we were to *Adam*, and yet that we in greater unlikeliness should receive a greater favour, this was the excess of the comparison, and this is the free gift of God.

17. For if by  
 one offence so it  
 is in the Kings  
*MS. or,*] if by  
 one mans offence  
 death reigned by  
 one, much more  
 they which re-  
 ceive abundance  
 of grace, and of  
 the gift of righ-  
 teousnesse, shall  
 reign in life by  
 one Jesus Christ.)

And this is the  
 third degree, or  
 measure of ex-  
 cesse of efficacy  
 on Christs part,  
 over it was on the  
 part of *Adam*.  
 For if the sin of  
*Adam* alone could  
 bring death upon  
 the world, who  
 by imitation of  
 his transgression  
 on the stock of  
 their own natural  
 choice did sin against God, though  
 not after the similitude of *Adams*  
 transgression: much more shall we,  
 who not onely receive the aides of  
 the spirit of grace, but receive them  
 also in an abundant measure, re-  
 ceive also the effect of all this, even  
 to reign in life by one Jesus Christ.

18. There-

18. *Therefore as by the offence of one judgement came upon all men to condemnation: even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.* } Therefore now to return to the other part of the similitude where I began; although I have shown the great excellence and abundance of grace by Christ, over the evil that did descend by Adam; yet the proportion and comparison lies in the main emanation of death from one, and life from the other; [*judgement unto condemnation*] that is, the sentence of death came upon all men by the offence of one; even so, by a like Oeconomy and dispensation, God would not be behind in doing an act of Grace, as he did before of judgement: and as that judgement was not to condemna-

tion by the offence of one: so the free gift, and grace came upon all to justification of life, by the righteousness of one.

<p>19. For as by one mans dis- obedience many were made sin- ners: so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.</p>	<p>The sum of all is this; by the dis- obedience of one man καλέσθησαν οἱ πολλοὶ many were constituted or put into the or- der of sinners they were made such</p>
---	---

by Gods appointment, that is, not that God could be the Author of a sin to any, but that he appointed the evill which is the consequent of sin, to be upon their heads who descended from the sinner: & so it shall be on the other side; for by the obedience of one, even of Christ, many shall be made, or constituted righteous. But still this must be with a supposition of what was said before, that

*the Divine Attributes.* 125

that there was a vast difference; for we are made much more righteous by Christ, then we were sinners by *Adam*; and the life we receive by Christ shall be greater then the death by *Adam*; and the graces we derive from Christ, shall be more and mightier then the corruption and declination by *Adam*; but yet as one is the head, so is the other: one is the beginning of sinne and death, and the other of life and righteousness.

Now the consequent of this discourse must needs at least be this; that it is impossible that the greatest part of mankinde should be left in the eternal bonds of hell by *Adam*; for then quite contrary to the discourse of the Apostle, there had been abundance of sin, but a scarcity of grace; and the access had been on the part of *Adam*, not on the part of Christ, against which he so mighti-

mightily and artificially contends: so that the *Presbyterian* way is perfectly condemned by this discourse of the Apostle; and the other more gentle way, which affirms that we were sentenc'd in *Adam* to eternal death, though the execution is taken off by Christ, is also no way countenanced by any thing in this Chapter; for that the judgement which for *Adams* sin came unto the condemnation of the world, was nothing but *temporal death*, is here affirmed; it being in no sense imaginable that the death which here Saint *Paul* sayes *passed upon all men*, and which *reigned from Adam to Moses*, should be eternal death; for the Apostle speaks of that death which was threatened to *Adam*; and of such a death which was afterwards threatened in *Moses* Law; and such a death which fell even upon the most righteous of *Adams* posterity,



posterity, *Abel*, and *Seth*, and *Methusela*, that is, upon them who did not sin after the similitude of *Adams* transgression. Since then, all the judgement which the Apostle saies, came by the sin of *Adam*, was expressly affirmed to be death temporal, that God should sentence mankinde to eternal damnation for *Adams* sin, though in goodnesse thorough Christ he afterwards took it off; is not at all affirm'd by the Apostle; and because in proportion to the evil, so was the imputation of the sin, it follows that *Adams* sin is ours metonymically and improperly; God was not finally angry with us, nor had so much as any designs of eternal displeasure upon that account; his anger went no further then the evils of this life, and therefore the imputation was not of a proper guilt, for that might justly have passed beyond

our grave ; if the sin had passed beyond a metonymie, or a juridical, external imputation. And of this God and Man have given this further testimony ; that as no man ever imposed penance for it ; so God himself in nature did never for it afflict or affright the conscience, and yet the Conscience never spares any man that is guilty of a known sin.

*Exemplo quodcunque malum committitur, ipse  
Displicet Authori,*

He that is guilty of a sin  
shall rue the crime that he lies in

And why the Conscience shall be for ever at so much peace for this sin, that a man shall never give one groan for his share of guilt in Adams sin, unlesse some or other  
scares

fcares him with an impertinent proposition; why (I say) the Conscience should not naturally be afflicted for it, nor so much as naturally know it, I confesse I cannot yet make any reasonable conjecture, save this onely, that it is not properly a sin, but onely metonymicall and improperly. And indeed there are some whole Churches which think themselves so little concern'd in the matter of Original sin, that they have not a word of it in all their Theology: I mean the Christians in the *East-Indies*, concerning whom *Fryer Luys de Urretta* in his Ecclesiastical story of *Æthiopia*, saies, that the Christians in *Æthiopia*, unde the Empire of *Prestre Juan*, never kept the immaculate conception of the *Virgin Mary* [*no se entremetieron en essas Teologias del peccado Original: porque nunca tuvieron los entendimientos may*  
*n etas-*

*metafisicos*, antes como gente *afable*, *benigna*, *Vana*, de entendimientos *conversables*, y *alaguenos*, seguian la *doctrina de los Santos antiguos*, y de los *sagrados Concilies*, *sin disputas*, ni *diferencias*] nor do they insert into their Theology any propositions concerning Original sin, nor trouble themselves with such Metaphysical contemplations; but being of an affable, ingenuous, gentle comportment, and understanding, follow the Doctrine of the primitive Saints and Holy Councils without disputation of difference, so sayes the story. But we unfortunatly trouble our selves by raising ideas of sin, and afflict our selves with our own dreams, and will not beleve but it is a vision. And the height of this imagination hath wrought so high in the Church of *Rome*, that when they would do great honour to the *Virgin Mary*, they were pleas'd

*the Divine Attributes.* 131

pleas'd to allow to her an immaculate conception without any Original sin, and a Holy-day appointed for the celebration of the dream. But the Christians in the other world are wiser, and trouble themselves with none of these things, but in simplicity, honour the Divine attributes, and speak nothing but what is easy to be understood. And indeed religion is then the best, and the world will be sure to have fewer Atheists, and fewer Blasphemers, when the understandings of witty men are not tempted, by commanding them to beleeve impossible articles, and unintelligible propositions: when every thing is believed by the same simplicity it is taught: when we do not call that a mystery which we are not able to prove, and tempt our faith to swallow that whole which reason cannot chew.

One

One thing I am to observe more, before I leave considering the words of the Apostle. The Apostle here having instituted a comparison between *Adam* and Christ; that as death came by one, so life by the other; *as by one we are made sinners, so by the other we are made righteous*; some from hence suppose they argue strongly to the overthrow of all that I have said; *thus*: Christ and *Adam* are compared, therefore as by Christ we are made really righteous: so by *Adam* we are made really sinners: our righteousness by Christ is more then imputed, and therefore so is our unrighteousness by *Adam*; To this, besides what I have already spoken in my humble addressees to that wise and charitable Prelate the Lord Bishop of *Rocheſter*, delivering the sense and objections of others

thers ; in which I have declared my sense of the imputation of Christ's righteousness; and besides, that although the Apostle offers at a similitude, yet he findes himself surprised, and that one part of the similitude does far exceed the other, and therefore nothing can follow hence ; but that if we receive evil from *Adam*, we shall much more receive good from Christ ; besides this I say, I have something very material to reply to the form of the argument, which is a very trick and fallacy. For the Apostle argues thus, *As by Adam we are made sinners, so by Christ we are made righteous ;* and that is very true ; and much more ; but to argue from hence [ as by Christ we are made *really* righteous, so by Adam we are made *really* sinners ] is to invert the purpose of the Apostle, (who argues from

134 *A Vindication of*

from the lesse to the greater) and to make it conclude affirmatively from the greater to the lesse in matter of power: as if one should say: If a childe can carry a ten pound weight, much more can a man: and therefore whatsoever a man can do, that also a childe can do. For though I can say, *If this thing be done in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry?* yet I must not say therefore, *If this be done in the dry tree, what shall be done in the green?* for the dry try of the Crosse could do much then the green tree in the Garden of Eden. It is a good argument to say; If the Devil be so potent to do a shrewd turn much more powerful is God to do good: but we cannot conclude from hence, but God can by his own meer power, and pleasure save a soul; therefore the  
Devil



*Divine Attributes.* 135

Devil can by his power ruine one: In a similitude, the first part may be, and often is, lesse then the second; but never greater: and therefore though the Apostle said, *as by Adam &c. So by Christ &c.* Yet we cannot say *as by Christ, so by Adam*: We may well reason thus. As by Nature there is a reward to evil doers; so much more is there by God; but we cannot by way of conversion, reason thus; As by God there is an eternal reward appointed to good actions; so by Nature there is an Eternal reward for evil ones. And who would not deride this way of arguing. As by our Fathers we receive temporal good things; so much more do we by God: but by God we also receive an immortal Soul; therefore from our Fathers we receive an immortal body.

dy. For not the consequent of a hypothetical proposition, but the antecedent is to be the assumption of the Syllogisme; This therefore is a fallacy, which when those wise persons, who are unwarily perswaded by it, shall observe, I doubt not but the whole way of arguing will appear unconvincing.

*Object. 6.* But it is objected that my Doctrine is against the ninth Article in the Church of *England*; and that I heare Madam does most of all stick with your Honour.

Of this Madam, I should not now have taken notice, because I have already answered it in some additional papers, which are already published; but that I was so  
de

*the Divine Attributes.* 137

delighted to hear and to know that a person of your interest and Honour, of your zeal and prudence, is so earnest for the Church of *England*, that I could not pass it by, without paying you that regard and just acknowledgment which so much excellencie deserves. But then Madam I am to say, that I could not be delighted in your zeal for our excellent Church, if I were not as zealous my self for it too: I have oftentimes subscribed that Article, and though if I had cause to dissent from it, I would certainly do it in those just measures which my duty on one side, and the interest of truth on the other would require of me; yet because I have no reason to disagree, I will not suffer my self to be supposed to be of a Differing judgement from  
my

138 *A Vindication of the*

my Dear Mother, which is the best Church of the world. Indeed Madam, I do not understand the words of the Article as most men do; but I understand them as they can be true, and as they can very fairely signifie, and as they agree with the word of God and right reason. But I remember that I have heard from a very good hand, and there are many alive this day that may remember to have heard it talk'd of publickly, that when Mr. *Thomas Rogers* had in the year 1584. published an exposition of the 39. Articles, many were not onely then, but long since very angry at him, that he by his interpretation had limited the charitable latitude which was allowed in the subscription to them. For the Articles being fram'd in a Church but newly reform'd, in  
which

which many complied with some unwillingnesse, and were not willing to have their consent broken by too great a straining, and even in the Convocation it self so many being of a differing judgement, it was very great prudence and piety to secure the peace of the Church by as much charitable latitude as they could contrive; and therefore the Articles in those things, which were publicly disputed at that time, even amongst the Doctors of the Reformation (such were the Articles of predestination, and this of Original sinne) were described, with incomparable wisdom and temper; and therefore I have reason to take it ill, if any man shall denie me liberty to use the benefit of the Churches wisdom; For I am ready a thousand times to subscribe the Article,  
if

if there can be just cause to do it so often; but as I impose upon no man my sense of the Article, but leave my reasons and him to struggle together for the best, so neither will I be bound to any one man, or any company of men but to my lawful Superiours, speaking there where they can and ought to oblige. Madam, I take nothing ill from any man, but that he should think I have a lesse zeal for our Church then himself, and I will by Gods assistance be all my life confuting him; and though I will not contend with him, yet I will die with him in behalf of the Church if God shall call me; but for other little things and trifling interests and little murmurs I value none of it.

*Quid*

*Quid verum atque decens curo, & ro-  
go, & omnis in hoc sum;*

*Condo & compono quod mox deprome-  
re possim,*

*Nullius addictus jurare in verba Ma-  
gistris:*

*Quo me cunque rapit tempestas dese-  
ror*

I could translate these also into bad English verse as I do the others; but that now I am earnest for my liberty, I will not so much as confine my self to the measures of feet. But in plain English I mean by rehearsing these latine verses, that although I love every man, and value worthy persons in proportion to their labours and abilities, whereby they can and do serve God

142 *A Vindication of the*

God and Gods Church, yet I inquire for what is fitting, not what is pleasing; I search after wayes to advantage soules, not to comply with humours, and Sects, and interests; and I am tied to no mans private opinion any more then he is to mine; if he will bring Scripture and right reason from any topic, he may govern me and perswade me, else I am free, as he is: but I hope I am before hand with him in this question. I end with the words of *Lucretius*.

*Desine quâ propter novitate exterritus  
ipsa*

*Expuere eo animo rationem, sed magis  
acri*

*Judicio perpende, & si tibi vera videatur.*

*Dede*



*A Vindication of the* 143

*Dede manus, aut si falsa est, accingere  
re contra.*

Fear not to own whats said, because  
'tis true,

Weigh well and wisely if the thing  
be true.

Truth and not conquest is the best  
reward;

'Gainst falshood onely stand upon  
thy guard.

The End.

G

Madam;



*M A D A M,*

**I** *Humbly begge you will  
be pleased to entertain  
these papers, not onely  
as a Testimony of my  
Zeal for truth and peace  
below, and for the Ho-  
nour of God above; but  
also*

also of my readinesse to  
seize upon every occasion  
whereby I may expresse my  
self to be

Your Honours most  
obliged and most  
Humble Servant  
in the Religion  
of the H. Jesus,  
Fer. Taylor.



The  
*Stationers Postscript*

To the  
**READER.**

**I** Am not my self ignorant, having learned it from those, whose words had in them reason and Authority too, that the world is most benefited by those pieces, which with greatest difficulty were gained from the modesty, or severity, or fears of their Authors. The fruits that first drop from the tree, are not the longest ere they rot, and the corn that lies longest in

*to the Reader.*

in the ground, *bis quæ solem, bis frigora*—— most pleases the Husband-man. I have some confidence, the Reader, who has yet given his name to no sect, will by the excellencies of this discourse I have now presented, be so fairly disposed to receive my excuse, when I tell him that I publish it without the Reverend Authors consent, that he will become rather a Patron than an Accuser of that great ambition, he observes in me, to offer something that may instruct him, and please him too. Because so many papers passe the Presse, that deserve to finde it the place of their Burial rather than their birth, I was persuaded, my Charity would have in it something more of merit. I intended a Benefit to the Reader, and if my designe meet with reproof in the Successe, I am sure

## *A Postscript*

it deserved none in its principle, for I shall not misse my aime, if his intentions in receiving instruction be but as cleer as mine were to assist him in my meener capacity. The Discourse in its own behalf will to the Intelligent give sufficient assurance, that though the Authors consent be wanting, nothing else is, that should come from him to make it intire: for I know what was fitted for the use and made able to endure the judgment of the Honourable person, who was the occasion of this, will with some security passe lesser judgements. And this favour the charitable Reader will the more easily grant me, because it will be a good advantage towards the recovering the favour of the worthy Person, who wrote the Discourse; whose displeasure I have reason  
to

*to the Reader.*

to fear, I have too far provoked by making his secrets publike without his leave. But if the intelligent Reader shall receive this little piece with the same kindnesse, as the others, that were sent from the same hand, the pleading of my own cause will put me to the lesse expence of words. And I know the Reverend Author governs all his passions with such an excellent charity, and levels all his designs of this kinde to that great end of advancing piety, and holy living, that my boldnesse will the more easily find pardon, because the right understanding of this Question has a great influence upon all the parts of holy obedience; and the discourses of this Letter, I have good authority to say, add much to the clearnesse and defence of his former writings upon this  
Sub-

## *A Postscript*

Subject. The question as it is necessary to be understood now, that it is set on foot, so is it very difficult to all these, that first choose their interest, and then such conclusions as are consistent with that, and frame their arguments and premisses last of all. And no man for this can charge me highly, but he must also affirme, it is fit some things be concealed, that would free the judgements of men from those prejudices of custome, partiality and humour, with which Error hath fortified her self in the understandings of many. The errors of this question are so deere to one kinde of men, that nothing will more provoke their pens, then to be contradicted in this Proposition; and for the advantage of truth and the common benefit, it was my designe, that whatsoever was

was



*to the Reader.*

was needful to be said to make the truth more clear, might first get possession of the understandings of men. Which could not, certainly, have been done if I had delayed my hand, till I could, at that great distance from me, where he lives, have consulted with the Author, and received returns from him. And have no lesse hope, that the Honourable Person, into whose Cabinet I have too boldly admitted the common eye, will pardon my presumption, because it is the interest of Religion, which is so dear to every rightly instructed Christian, that they will neither refuse for its advancement to give up their priviledges, nor their life. And when she feels the benefit of being free'd from those Scruples, which this Discourse was designed to remove, she will not conceive her  
light.

## *A Postscript*

light will be made less by being common, but will be rather pleased, to have obliged, by the emanations of a Pen so learned, all those that shall receive benefit from it.

---

*R. Royston.*

---

The names of some Books  
and Sermons written by  
*Jer. Taylor D.D.*

1. **E**<sup>Niculus</sup> N<sup>iculus</sup>, Course of Sermons  
for all the Sundayes in the  
yeer, together with a Discourse  
of the Divine Institution, Ne-  
cessity, and Separation of the  
Office Ministerial, in *fol.*
2. The History of the Life and  
Death of the Ever-blessed Jesus  
Christ, 2. Edit. in *fol.*
7. The Rules and Exercises of ho-  
ly living. in 12.
8. The Rule and Exercises of holy  
dying, in 12.
10. The Golden Grove, or, A Ma-  
nual of daily Prayers fitted to  
the dayes of the week, together  
with a short Method of Peace  
and Holiness.
11. The Doctrine and practise of  
Repentance rescued from Po-  
pular Errors, in a large 8. New-  
ly published.

## The Errata.

**P**Age. 93. line ult its. r. it. pag. 13. l. 12. and  
bred r. and to be bred. p. 134. l. 15. r. do much  
more then 142. l. 17. *expuere ex animo.* 36 l. 11. r.  
taken pleasure 61. l. 1. was brought off. r. was  
bought off. 85. l. 1. presence of novelty r the pre-  
sence of novelty. 99. l. ult. r. are not in.

A



# An Answer to a Letter 2

Written by the R. R.

The L<sup>d</sup> Bp of *Rochester*.

Concerning

The Chapter of *Original Sin*,

In the

*Unum Necessarium*.

---

By JER. TAYLOR D. D.

---



London, Printed by E. Cotes for R. Royston  
at the Angel in *Ivie-lane*, 1656.





# An Answer to a Letter

Written by the R. R.

*The L. Bp. of Rochester.*

*R. R. Father and my good Lord,*

**Y**Our Lordships Letter Dated  
*July 28.* I received not till  
*Septemb. 11.* it seems *R. Roy-*  
*ston* detained it in his hands, sup-  
 posing it could not come safely to  
 me while I remain a prisoner. But  
 I now have that liberty, that I can  
 receive any Letters, and send any;  
 for the Gentlemen under whose  
 custody I am, as they are carefull  
 of their charges, so they are civil  
 to my person. It was necessary I  
 should tell this to your Lordship,  
 that I may not be under a suspicion

B

in

## 2 *An Answer to a Letter*

of neglecting to give accounts in those particulars, which with so much prudence and charity you were pleased to represent in your Letter concerning my discourse of Original Sin. My Lord, in all your Exceptions, I cannot but observe your candor and your paternal care concerning me. For when there was nothing in the Doctrine, but your greater reason did easily see the justice and the truth of it, and I am perswaded could have taught me to have said many more material things in confirmation of what I have taught; yet so careful is your charity of me, that you would not omit to represent to my consideration what might be said by captious and weaker persons; or by the more wise and pious who are of a different judgement.

But my Lord, first you are pleased to note that this discourse runs not  
in

*touching Original Sin.* 3

the ordinary channel. True; for if it did, it must nurse the popular error: but when the disease is epidemical, as it is so much the worse, so the extraordinary remedy must be acknowledg'd to be the better. And if there be in it some things hard to be understood, as it was the fate of *S. Paul's* Epistles (as your Lordship notes out of *S. Peter*) yet this difficulty of understanding proceeds not from the thing it self, nor from the manner of handling it, but from the indisposition and prepossession of mens minds to the contrary, who are angry when they are told that they have been deceived: for it is usuall with men to be more displeased, when they are told they were in error, then to be pleased with them who offer to lead them out of it.

But your Lordship doth with great advantages represent an ob-

#### 4 *An Answer to a Letter*

jection of some captious persons, which relates not to the material part of the Question, but to the rules of art. If there be no such thing as Original Sin transmitted from *Adam* to his posterity, then all that sixth chapter is a strife about a shadow, a *Non ens*. A. It is true my Lord, the Question as it is usually handled, is so. For when the Franciscan and Dominican do eternally dispute about the conception of the Blessed Virgin, whether it was with, or without Original Sin, meaning by way of grace and special exemption, this is *de non ente*; for there was no need of any such exemption: and they supposing that commonly it was otherwise, troubled themselves about the exception of a Rule, which in that sense which they suppos'd it, was not true at all: she was born as innocent from any impurity or formal guilt as *Adam* was created,

*touching Original Sin.* 5

created, and so was her Mother, and so was all her family. \* When the Lutheran and the Roman dispute, whether justice and original righteousness in *Adam* was Natural or by Grace, it is *de non ente*: for it was positively neither, but negatively only; he had original righteousness till he sin'd, that is, he was righteous till he became unrighteous. \* When the Calvinist troubles himself and his Parishioners with fierce declamations against natural inclinations or concupiscence, and disputes whether it remains in baptized persons, or whether it be taken off by Election, or by the Sacrament, whether to all Christians or to some few; this is a *οὐταυαχία*; for it is no sin at all in persons baptiz'd or unbaptiz'd, till it be consented to.

My Lord, when I was a young man in *Cambridge*, I knew a learned professor of Divinity, whose

## 6 *An Answer to a Letter*

ordinary Lectures in the Lady *Margarets* Chair for many years together, nine as I suppose, or thereabouts, were concerning Original Sin, and the appendant questions: This indeed could not choose but be *Andabatarum conflictus*. But then my discourse representing that these disputes are uselesse, and, as they discourse usually, to be *de non ente*, is not to be reprov'd. For I profess to evince that many of those things, of the sense of which they dispute, are not true at all in any sense, I declare them to be *de non ente*, that is, I untie their intricate knots by cutting them in pieces. For when a false proposition is the ground of disputes, the process must needs be infinite, unless you discover the first error. He that tels them they both fight about a shadow, and with many arguments proves the vanity of their whole pro-

## touching Original Sin. 7

proceſſe, they (if he ſaies true) not he is the *ουδμαχ*. \* When S. *Auſtine* was horribly puzzled about the traduction of Original Sin, and thought himſelf forc'd to ſay that either the Father begat the ſoul, or that he could not tranſmit ſin which is ſubjected in the ſoul, or at leaſt he could not tell how it was tranſmitted: he had no way to be relieved but by being told that Original Sin was not ſubjected in the ſoul, becauſe properly and formally it was no reall ſin of ours at all; but that it was only by imputation, and to certain purpoſes, not any inherent quality, or corruption: and ſo in effect all his trouble was *de non ente*. \* But now ſome wits have lately riſen in the Church of *Rome*, and they tell us another ſtory. The ſoul followes the temperature of the body, and ſo Original Sin comes to be tranſmitted by

## 8 *An Answer to a Letter*

contact: because the constitution of the body is the *fomes* or nest of the sin, and the souls concupiscence is deriv'd from the bodies lust. But besides that this fancy disappears at the first handling, and there would be so many Original Sins as there are several constitutions, and the guilt would not be equal, and they who are born Eunuchs should be lesse infected by *Adam's* pollution, by having lesse of concupiscence in the great instance of desires, [and after all, concupiscence it self could not be a sin in the soul, till the body was grown up to strength enough to infect it] Besides all this, (I say) while one does not know how Original Sin can be derived, and another who thinks he can, names a wrong way, and both the waies infer it to be another kinde of thing then all the Schools of learning teach [and in  
the



*touching Original Sin.* 9

the whole process it must be an impossible thing, because the instrument which hath all its operations by the force of the principal agent, cannot of it self produce a great change and violent effect upon the principal agent] does it not too clearly demonstrate, that all that infinite variety of fancies agreeing in nothing but in an endless uncertainty, is nothing else but a being busie about the quiddities of a dream, and the constituent parts of a shadow? But then, My Lord, my discourse representing all this to be vanity and uncertainty, ought not to be call'd or suppos'd to be a *μετανοησις*: as he that ends the question between two Schoolmen disputing about the place of Purgatory, by saying they need not trouble themselves about the place; for that which is not, hath no place at all; ought not to be told he contends about a shadow, when he

## 10 *An Answer to a Letter*

proves that to be true, which he suggested to the two trifling litigants.

But as to the thing it self: I do not say there is no such thing as Original Sin, but it is not that which it is supposed to be: it is not our sin formally, but by imputation only; and it is imputed so, as to be an inlet to sickness, death and disorder: but it does not introduce a necessity of sinning, nor damn any one to the flames of Hell. So that Original Sin is not a *Non ens*, unless that be nothing which infers so many real mischiefs.

The next thing your Lordship is pleas'd to note to me, is that in your wisdom you foresee, some will argue against my explication of the word *Damnation*, in the ninth Article of our Church, which affirms that Original Sin deserves damnation. Concerning which, My Lord, I do thus (and I hope fairly) acquit my self.

I. That

*touching Original Sin.* 11

1. That it having been affirmed by S. *Austin* that Infants dying unbaptized are damn'd, he is deservedly called *Durus pater Infantum*, and generally forsaken by all sober men of the later ages: and it will be an intolerable thing to think the Church of *England* guilty of that which all her wiser sons, and all the Christian Churches generally abhorre. I remember that I have heard that King *James* reproving a Scottish Minister, who refus'd to give private Baptism to a dying Infant, being askt by the Minister, if he thought the childe should be damn'd for want of Baptism? answer'd, No, but I think you may be damn'd for refusing it: and he said well. But then my Lord, If Original Sin deserves damnation, then may Infants be damn'd if they die without Baptism. But if it be a horrible affirmative, to say that  
the

## 12 *An Answer to a Letter*

the poor babes shall be made Devils, or enter into their portion, if they want that ceremony, which is the only gate, the only way of salvation that stands open; then the word [*Damnation*] in the 9. Article must mean something less, then what we usually understand by it: or else the Article must be salved by expounding some other word to an allay and lessening of the horrible sentence; and particularly the word [*Deserves*] of which I shall afterwards give account. Both these waies I follow. The first is the way of the Schoolmen.

For they suppose the state of unbaptized Infants to be a *pæna damni*; and they are confident enough to say that this may be well suppos'd without inferring their suffering the pains of hell. But this sentence of theirs I admit and explicate with some little difference of expression.

For

*touching Original Sin.* 13

For so far I admit this *pain of loss*, or rather a deficiency from going to Heaven, to be the consequence of *Adam's* sin, that by it we being left *in meris Naturalibus*, could never by these strengths alone have gone to Heaven. Now whereas your Lordship in behalf of those whom you suppose may be captious, is pleas'd to argue. That as loss of sight or eyes infers a state of darkness or blindness: so the losse of Heaven infers Hell; and if Infants go not to heaven in that state, whither can they go but to hell? and that's Damnation in the greatest sense. I grant it, that if *in the event of things* they do not go to Heaven (as things are now ordered) it is but too likely that they go to Hell: but I adde, that as all darkness does not infer horror and distraction of minde, or fearful apparitions and phantasms: so neither does all Hell,  
or

## 14 *An Answer to a Letter*

or states in Hell infer all those torments which the Schoolmen signify by a *pæna sensus* (for I speak now in pursuance of their way). So that there is no necessity of a third place; but it concludes only that in the state of separation from Gods presence there is a great variety of degrees and kinds of evil, and every one is not the extreme: and yet by the way, let me observe, that *Gregory Nazianzen* and *Nicetas* taught that there is a third place for Infants and Heathens: and *Irenæus* affirm'd that the evils of Hell were not eternal to all, but to the Devils only and the greater criminals. But neither they nor we, nor any man else can tell whether Hell be a place or no. It is a state of evil; but whether all the damned be in one or in twenty places, we cannot tell.

But I have no need to make use  
of

## *touching Original Sin.* 75

of any of this. For when I affirm that Infants being by *Adam* reduc'd and left to their meer natural state, fall short of Heaven; I do not say they cannot go to Heaven at all, but they cannot go thither by their naturall powers, they cannot without a new grace and favour go to heaven. But then it cannot presently be inferred, that therefore they go to hell; but this ought to be infer'd, which indeed was the real consequent of it; therefore it is necessary that Gods Grace should supply this defect, if God intends Heaven to them at all; and because Nature cannot, God sent a Saviour by whom it was effected. But if it be asked, what if this grace had not come? and that it be said, that without Gods grace they must have gone to Hell, because without it they could not go to Heaven? I answer, That we know how it is, now that God in his goodness hath  
made,

## 16 *An Answer to a Letter*

made provisions for them: but if he had not made such provisions, what would have been we know not, any more then we know what would have followed, if *Adam* had not sinned; where he should have liv'd, and how long, and in what circumstances the posterity should have been provided for in all their possible contingencies. But yet, this I know, that it followes not, that if without *this Grace* we could not have gone to Heaven, that therefore we must have gone to Hel. For although the first was ordinarily impossible, yet the second was absolutely unjust, and against Gods goodness, and therefore more impossible. But because the first could not be done by nature, God was pleased to promise and to give his grace, that he might bring us to that state whither he had design'd us, that is, to a supernatural felicity. If *Adam* had not fallen, yet Heaven had not been



*touching Original Sin.* 17

a natural consequent of his obedience, but a Gracious, it had been a gift still : and of *Adam* though he had persisted in innocence, it is true to say, that without Gods Grace, that is, by the meer force of Nature, he could never have arriv'd to a Supernatural state, that is, to the joyes of Heaven ; and yet it does not follow, that if he had remain'd in Innocence, he must have gone to Hell. Just so it is in Infants, Hell was not made for man, but for Devils ; and therefore it must be something besides meer Nature that can bear any man thither : meer Nature goes neither to Heaven nor Hell. So that when I say Infants naturally cannot go to Heaven, and that this is a punishment of *Adam's* sin, he being for it punished with a loss of his gracious condition, and devolv'd to the state of Nature, and we by him left  
so ;

## 18 *An Answer to a Letter*

so; my meaning is, that this Damnation which is of our Nature, is but negative, that is, as a consequent of our Patriarchs sin, our Nature is left imperfect and deficient in order to a supernatural end, which the Schoolmen call a *pæna damni*, but improperly: they indeed think it may be a real event, and final condition of persons as well as things: but I affirm it was an evil effect of *Adam's* sin: but in the event of things it became to the persons the way to a new grace, and hath no other event as to Heaven and Hell directly and immediately. In the same sense and to the same purpose I understand the word Damnation in the 9. Article.

But the word [Damnation] may very well, truly, and sufficiently signify all the purposes of the Article, if it be taken only for the effect of that sentence which was inflicted  
upon

*touching Original Sin. 19*

upon *Adam*, and descended on his posterity, that is, for condemnation to Death, and the evils of mortality. So the word is used by *S. Paul* 1 Cor. 11. 29. *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh Damnation to himself.* *Kelpa* is the word, but that it did particularly signifie temporal death and evils, appears by the instances of probation in the next words, *For, for this cause some are weak amongst you, some are sick, and some are fallen asleep.* This also in the Article. Original Sin deserves damnation, that is, it justly brought in the angry sentence of God upon Man, it brought him to death, and deserv'd it: it brought it upon us, and deserv'd it too. I do not say that we by that sin deserv'd that death, neither can death be properly a punishment of us till we superadde some evil of our own; yet *Adam's*  
fin

## 20 *An Answer to a Letter*

sin deserv'd it so, that it was justly left to fall upon us, we as a consequent and punishment of his sin being reduc'd to our natural portion. *In odiosis quod minimum est sequimur.* The lesser sense of the word is certainly agreeable to truth and reason: and it were good we us'd the word in that sense which may best warrant her doctrine, especially for that use of the word, having the precedent of Scripture.

I am confirm'd in this interpretation by the 2. S. of the Article: *viz.* of the remanency of concupiscence or Original Sin in the Regenerate. All the sinfulness of Original Sin is the lust or concupiscence, that is, the proneness to sin. Now then I demand, whether Concupiscence before aetual consent be a sin or no? and if it be a sin, whether it deserves damnation? That  
all

*touching Original Sin.* 21

all sin deserves damnation, I am sure our Church denies not. If therefore concupiscence before consent be a sin, then this also deserves damnation where ever it is: and if so, then a man may be damned for Original Sin even after Baptism. For even after Baptism, concupiscence (or the sinfulness of Original Sin) remains in the regenerate: and that which is the same thing, the same viciousness, the same enmity to God after Baptism, is as damnable, it deserves damnation as much as that did that went before. If it be replied, that Baptism takes off the guilt or formal part of it, but leaves the material part behinde, that is, though concupiscence remains, yet it shall not bring damnation to the regenerate or Baptized. I answer, that though baptismal regeneration puts a man into a state of grace and favour, so that what went

## 22 *An Answer to a Letter*

went before shall not be imputed to him afterwards, that is, *Adam's* sin shall not bring damnation (in any sense) yet it hinders not, but that what is sinful afterwards shall be then imputed to him, that is, he may be damn'd for his own concupiscence. He is quitted from it as it came from *Adam*; but by Baptism he is not quitted from it, as it is subjected in himself, if (I say) concupiscence before consent be a sin. If it be no sin, then for it, Infants unbaptized cannot with justice be damn'd; it does not deserve damnation: but if it be a sin, then so long as it is there, so long it deserves damnation; and Baptism did only quit the relation of it to *Adam* (for that was all that went before it) but not the danger of the man. \* But because the Article supposes that it does not damn the regenerate or baptized, and yet that it hath the nature

*touching Original Sin.* 23

nure of sin, it follows evidently and undeniably, that both the phrases are to be diminished and understood in a favourable sense. As the phrase [the Nature of sin] signifies; so does [Damnation] but [the Nature of sin] signifies something that brings no guilt, because it is affirm'd to be in the Regenerate, therefore [Damnation] signifies something that brings no Hell: but [to deserve Damnation] must mean something lesse then ordinary, that is, that concupiscence is a thing not morally good, not to be allowed of, not to be nurs'd, but mortifi'd, fought against, disapprov'd, *condemn'd* and disallowed of men as it is of God.

And truly My Lord, to say that for *Adam's* sin it is just in God to condemn Infants to the eternal flames of Hell: and to say, that concupiscence or natural inclinatio-  
ons

## 24 *An Answer to a Letter*

ons before they pass into any act, could bring eternal condemnation from Gods presence into the eternall portion of Devils, are two such horrid propositions, that if any Church in the world would expressly affirm them, I for my part should think it unlawful to communicate with her in the defence or profession of either, and do think it would be the greatest temptation in the world to make men not to love God, of whom men so easily speak such horrid things. I would suppose the Article to mean any thing rather then either of these. But yet one thing more I have to say.

The Article is certainly to be expounded according to the analogy of faith, and the express words of Scripture, if there be any that speak expressly in this matter. Now whereas the Article explicating Original Sin affirms it to be that fault  
or



*touching Original Sin.* 25

of corruption of mans nature (*vitium Natura*, not *peccatum*) by which he is far gone from originall righteousness, and is inclin'd to evil: because this is not full enough, the Article adds by way of explanation [*So that the flesh lusteth against the spirit*] that is, it really produces a state of evil temptations: it lusteth, that is, actually and habitually; [it lusteth against the spirit, and therefore deserves Gods wrath and damnation] So the Article: *Therefore*; for no other reason but because the flesh lusteth against the spirit; not because it can lust, or is *apta nata* to lust, but because it lusteth *actually*, therefore it deserves damnation: and this is *Original Sin*: or as the Article expresses it, *it hath the nature of sin*; it is the *fomes*, or matter of sin, and is in the original of man-  
C kinde,

## 26 *An Answer to a Letter*

kinde, and deriv'd from *Adam* as our body is, but it deserves not damnation in the highest sense of the word, till the concupiscence be actual. Till then, the words of [Wrath and Damnation] must be meant in the less and more easie signification, according to the former explication: and must only relate to the personal sin of *Adam*. To this sense of the Article I heartily subscribe. For besides the reasonableness of the thing, and the very manner of speaking us'd in the Article; it is the very same way of speaking, and exactly the same doctrine which we finde in *S. James*, (*Jam. I. 14.*) Ἐπιθυμία συλλαβῆσα: *Concupiscence*, when it is impregnated, when it hath conceiv'd, then it brings forth sin: and sin when it is in production, and birth, brings forth death. But in Infants, concupiscence

*touching Original Sin.* 27

piscence is innocent and a virgin, it conceives not, and therefore is without sin, and therefore without death or damnation. \* Against these expositions I cannot imagine what can be really and materially objected.

But my Lord, I perceive the main outcry is like to be upon the authority of the *Harmony of Confessions*. Concerning which I shall say this, that in this Article the Harmony makes as good musick as bells ringing backward; and they agree, especially when they come to be explicated and untwisted into their minute and explicate meanings, as much as *Lutheran* and *Calvinist*, as *Papist* and *Protestant*, as *Thomas* and *Scotus*, as *Remonstrant* and *Dordrechtan*, that is, as much as *pro* and *con*, or but a very little more. I have not the book with me here

## 28 *An Answer to a Letter*

in prison, and this neighbourhood cannot supply me, and I dare not trust my memory to give a scheme of it: but your Lordship knows that in nothing more do the reformed Churches disagree, then in this and its appendages; and you are pleased to hint something of it, by saying that some speak more of this than the Church of *England*: and *Andrew Rivet*, though unwillingly, yet confesses, *de Confessionibus nostris & earum syntagmate vel Harmonia, etiamsi in non nullis capitibus non planè convenient, dicam tamen, melius in concordiam redigi posse quàm in Ecclesia Romana concordantiam discordantium Canonum, quo titulo decretum Gratiani, quod Canonistis regulas præfigit, solet insigniri.* And what he affirms of the whole collection, is most notorious in the Article

*touching Original Sin.* 29

ticle of Original Sin. For my own part I am ready to subscribe the first *Helvetian* confession, but not the second. So much difference there is in the confessions of the same Church.

Now whereas your Lordship adds, that though they are fallible, yet when they bring evidence of holy Writ, their assertions are infallible, and not to be contradicted: I am bound to reply, that when they do so, whether they be infallible or no, I will beleieve them, because then though they might, yet they are not deceived. But as evidence of holy Writ had been sufficient without their authority: so without such evidence their authority is nothing. But then, My Lord, their citing and urging the words of *S. Paul*, *Rom. 5. 12.* is so far from being an evident probation of their Ar-

## 30 *An Answer to a Letter*

ticle, that nothing is to me a surer argument of their fallibility, then the urging of that which evidently makes nothing for them, but much against them : As 1. Affirming expressly that death was the event of *Adam's* sin; the whole event, for it names no other; temporal death; according to that saying of *S. Paul*, 1 Cor. 15. *In Adam we all die.* And 2. Affirming this process of death to be ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἡμαρτον, which is and ought to be taken to be the allay or condition of the condemnation. It became a punishment to them only who did sin; *but upon them also inflicted for Adam's sake.*

A like expression to which is in the Psalms, *Psal. 106. 32, 33. They angered him also at the waters of strife, so that he punished Moses for their sakes.* Here was plainly

## *touching Original Sin. 31*

a traduction of evil from the Nation to *Moses* their relative: For their sakes he was punished, but yet *ἐφ' ὃν Μωϋσὴς ἠμαρτε* for as much as *Moses* had sin'd: for so it followes, *because they provoked his spirit, so that he spake unadvisedly with his lips.* So it is between *Adam* and us. He sin'd and God was highly displeased. This displeasure went further then upon *Adam's* sin: for though that only was threatned with death, yet the sins of his children which were not so threatned, became so punished, and they were by nature heirs of wrath and damnation; that is, for his sake our sins inherited his curse. The curse that was specially and only threatned to him, we when we sin'd did inherit for his sake. So that it is not so properly to be called, *Original Sin*, as an *original curse* upon our sin.

## 32 *An Answer to a Letter*

To this purpose we have also another example of God transmitting the curse from one to another: Both were sinners, but one was the original of the curse or punishment. So said the Prophet to the wife of *Feroboam*, 1 King. 14: 16. [*He shall give Israel up because of the sins of Jeroboam, who did sin, and who made Israel to sin*] *Fereboam* was the root of the sin and of the curse. Here it was also (that I may use the words of the Apostle) that *by the sin of one man* [*Jeroboam*] *sin went out into all* [*Israel*] *and the curse, captivity, or death by sin, and so death went upon all men* [*of Israel*] *ἐπ' ὅμης πάντες ἥμαρτον* *in as much as all men* [*of Israel*] *have sinned*. If these men had not sinned, they had not been punished: I cannot say they had not been afflicted; for *David's* childe was smitten

ten



*touching Original Sin.* 33

ten for his fathers fault: but though they did sin, yet unless their root and principal had sinned, possibly they should not have so been punish'd: For his sake the punishment came. Upon the same account it may be, that we may inherit the damnation or curse for *Adam's* sake, though we deserve it; yet it being transmitted from *Adam* and not particularly threatened to the first posterity, we were his heirs, the heirs of death, deriving from him an original curse, but due also (if God so pleased) to our sins. And this is the full sense of the 12. verse, and the effect of the phrase ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον.

But your Lordship is pleased to object that though ἐφ' ᾧ does once signifie [For as much as] yet three times it signifies *in* or *by*. To this I would be content to

### 34 *An Answer to a Letter*

submit, if the observation could be verified, and be material when it were true. But besides that it is so used in 2 Cor. 5. 4. your Lordship may please to see it used (as not only my self, but indeed most men, and particularly the Church of *England* does read it and expound it) in Mat. 26. 50. And yet if *in* & were written *by* &, which is the same with *in* or *by*, if it be rendred word for word, yet *by* & twice in the Scripture signifies [for as much as] as you may read Rom. 8. 3. & Heb. 2. 18. So that here are two places besides this in question, and two more *ex abundanti* to shew, that if it were not *in* &, but said in words expressly as you would have it in the meaning, yet even so neither the thing, nor any part of the thing could be eyicted against me:  
and

*touching Original Sin.* 35

and lastly, if it were not only said *in* *q* but that that sense of it were admitted which is desired, and that it did mean *in* or *by* in this very place: yet the Question were not at all the nearer to be concluded against me. For I grant that it is true [*in him we are all sinners*] as it is true that [*in him we all die*] that is, for his sake we are us'd as sinners; being miserable really, but sinners in account and effect: as I have largely discoursed in my book. But then for the place here in question, it is so certain that it signifies the same thing (as our Church reads it) that it is not sense without it, but a violent breach of the period without precedent or reason. And after all; I have looked upon those places where *in* *q* is said to signifie *in* or *by*; and in one of them I finde it so;  
Mat.

## 36 *An Answer to a Letter*

Mar. 2. 4. but in Act. 3. 16. & Phil. 1. 3. I finde it not at all in any sense: but *em* indeed is used for *in* or *by*, in that of the Acts; and in the other it signifies, *at* or *upon*; but if all were granted that is pretended to, it no way prejudices my cause, as I have already proved.

Next to these your Lordship seems a little more zealous and decretory in the Question upon the confidence of the 17, 18, & 19. verses of the 5. chapter to the Romans. The sum of which as your Lordship most ingeniously sums it up, is this. "As by one  
 " many were made sinners: so by  
 " one many were made righteous,  
 " that by *Adam*, this by *Christ*.  
 " But by *Christ* we are made  
 " *Νεγροι* just, not by imputation  
 " only, but effectively and to real  
 " purposes; therefore by *Adam*  
 " we

*touching Original Sin.* 37

“we are really made sinners. And  
“this your Lordship confirms by  
“the observation of the sense of  
“two words here used by the A-  
“postle, The first is *κατάκριμα*,  
“which signifies a sentence of  
“guilt, or punishment for sin,  
“and this sin to be theirs upon  
“whom the condemnation comes,  
“because God punishes none but  
“for their own sin, Ezek. 18.  
“2. From the word *ῥημοῖ* clear  
“from sin, so your Lordship ren-  
“ders it: and in opposition to  
“this, *ἁμαρτωλοὶ* is to be rendred,  
“that is, guilty, criminal per-  
“sons, really and properly. This  
is all which the wit of man can  
say from this place of *S. Paul*,  
and if I make it appear that  
this is invalid, I hope I am se-  
cure.

To this then, I answer: That  
the Antithesis in these words here  
urg'd,

## 38 *An Answer to a Letter*

urg'd, (for there is another in the chapter) and this whole argument of *S. Paul* is full and intire without descending to minutes. Death came in by one man, much more shall life come by one man; if that by *Adam*, then much more this by *Christ*: by him to condemnation, by this man to justification. This is enough to verifie the argument of *S. Paul*, though life and death did not come in the same manner to the several relatives; as indeed they did not: of which afterwards. But for the present: It runs thus: By *Adam* we were made sinners; by *Christ* we are made righteous: As certainly one as the other, though not in the same manner of dispensation. By *Adam* *θάνατος ἐβασίλευσε* death reigned; by this man the reign of death shall be destroyed, and life set up in  
stead.

## *touching Original Sin.* 39

stead of it; by him we were us'd as sinners, for in him we died: but by Christ we are justified, that is, us'd as just persons, for by him we live. This is sufficient for the Apostles argument, and yet no necessity to affirm that we are sinners in *Adams* any more then by imputation: for we are by Christ made just no otherwise then by imputation.

In the proof or perswasion I will use no indirect arguments, as to say, that to deny us to be just by imputation is the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* and of the *Socinian* Conventicles, but expressly dislik'd by all the *Lutheran*, *Calvinist*, and *Zwinglian* Churches, and particularly by the Church of *England*, and indeed by the whole Harmony of Confessions.

## 40 *An Answer to a Letter*

fions: this I say, I will not make use of; not only because I my self do not love to be press'd by such prejudices rather than arguments; but because the question of the imputation of righteousness is very much mistaken and misunderstood on all hands. They that say that Christs righteousness is imputed to us for justification, do it upon this account, because they know all that we do is imperfect, therefore they think themselves constrain'd to flie to Christ's righteousness, and think it must be imputed to us, or we perish. The other side, considering that this way would destroy the necessity of holy living; and that in order to our justification, there were conditions requir'd on our parts, think it necessary to say that we are justified by inherent righteousness. Between these the  
truth.



## *touching Original Sin.* 41

truth is plain enough to be read.

Thus:

Christ's righteousness is not imputed to us for justification directly and immediately; neither can we be justified by our own righteousness: but our Faith and sincere endeavours are through Christ accepted in stead of legal righteousness: that is; we are justified through Christ, by imputation, not of Christs, nor our own righteousness: but of our faith and endeavours of righteousness as if they were perfect: and we are justified by a Non-imputation, *viz.* of our past sins, and present unavoidable imperfections: that is, we are handled as if we were just persons and no sinners. So faith was imputed to *Abraham* for righteousness; not that it made him so, *legally*, but *Evangelically*, that is, by grace and imputation. And

## 42 *An Answer to a Letter*

And indeed My Lord, that I may speak freely in this great question: when one man hath sin'd, his descendents and relatives, cannot possibly by him, or for him, or in him be made sinners properly and really. For in sin there are but two things imaginable: the irregular action; and the guilt, or obligation to punishment. Now we cannot in any sense be said to have done the action which another did, and not we: the action is as individual as the person; and *Titius* may as well be *Cajus*, and the Son be his own Father, as he can be said to have done the Fathers action; and therefore we cannot possibly be guilty of it: for guilt is an obligation to punishment for having done it: the action and the guilt are relatives; one cannot be without the other: something must be done inwardly  
or

*touching Original Sin.* 43

or outwardly, or there can be no guilt. \* But then for the evil of punishment, that may pass further than the action. If it passes upon the innocent, it is not a punishment to them; but an evil inflicted by right of Dominion; but yet by reason of the relation of the afflicted to him that sin'd, to him it is a punishment. But if it passes upon others that are not innocent, then it is a punishment to both; to the first principally; to the Descendents or Relatives, for the others sake; his sin being imputed so far.

How far that is in the present case, and what it is, the Apostle expresses thus: It was *ἀρχὴ εἰς κατάνκριμα*; vers. 18. or *κρίμα εἰς κατάνκριμα*, vers. 16. a curse unto condemnation, or a judgement unto condemnation, that is, a curse inherited from the principal; deserv'd  
by

## 44 *An Answer to a Letter*

by him, and yet also actually descending upon us after we had sin'd, *ἀεὶ* or *κείμεν ἐν κατίκειμα*; that is the judgement passed upon *Adam*; the *ἀεὶ*, or *κείμεν* was on him; but it prov'd to be a *κατίκειμα*, or a through condemnation when from him it passed upon all men that sin'd. *Κείμεν* and *κατίκειμα* sometimes differ in degrees: so the words are used by *S. Paul* elsewhere (*1 Cor. 11. 32.*) *κρινόμενοι ἢ ἡμῶν καὶ κατακρινόμενοι*; a judgement to prevent a punishment, or a less to forestal a greater in the same kinde: so here the *ἀεὶ* pass'd further; the *κείμεν* was fulfilled in his posterity passing on further, *vid.* that all who sin'd should pass under the power of death as well as he: but this became formally and actually a punishment to them only who did sin personally: to them it was *κατίκειμα*.

This

## touching Original Sin. 45

This αἰὼς or κείμεν, is the βασιλεία τοῦ θανάτου, vers. 17. the reign of death; this is called βασιλεία τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐν τοῦ θανάτου, vers. 21. the reign of sin in death: that is, the effect which *Adam's* sin had, was only to bring in the reign of death, which is already broken by Jesus Christ, and at last shall be quite destroyed. But to say that sin here is properly transmitted to us from *Adam*, formally, and so as to be inherent in us, is to say that we were made to do his action, which is a perfect contradiction.

Now then your Lordship sees that what you note of the meaning of κτάκεν I admit, and is indeed true enough, and agreeable to the discourse of the Apostle, and very much in justification of what I taught. κτάκεν signifies a punishment for sin, and this sin to be theirs upon whom  
the

## 46 *An Answer to a Letter*

the condemnation comes. I easily subscribe to it: but then take in the words of *S. Paul*, *ἡ ἐν ᾧ πάντες ἠναγκάσθημεν*, by one sin, or by the sin of one the curse passed upon all men unto condemnation; that is, the curse descended from *Adam*; for his sake it was propagated *εἰς κατάντημα* to a real condemnation, *ὡς*, when they should sin. For though this *ἡ ἐν* or the curse of death was threatned only to *Adam*, yet upon Gods being angry with him, God resolved it should descend: and if men did sin as *Adam*, or if they did sin at all, though less than *Adam*, yet the *ἡ ἐν* or the curse threatned to him should pass *εἰς κατάντημα* unto the same actual condemnation which fell upon him, that is, it should actually bring them under the reign of death.

But

*touching Original Sin.* 47

But then my Lord, I beseech you let it be considered, if this *κατάκριμα* must suppose a punishment for sin, for the sin of him, his own sin that is so condemn'd, as your Lordship proves perfectly out of Ezek. 18. how can it be just that the *κατάκριμα* condemnation should pass upon us for *Adam's* sin, that is, not for his own sin who is so condemn'd, but for the sin of another? *S. Paul* easily resolves the doubt, if there had been any. The *κατάκριμα*, the reign of death passed upon all men ἐν ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον in as much as all men have sinned. And now why shall we suppose that we must be guilty of what we did not, when without any such *φανόρην* there is so much guilt of what we did really and personally? why shall it be that we die only for *Adam's* sin, and not rather as  
*S. Paul*

## 48 *An Answer to a Letter*

S. *Paul* expressly affirms ἐφ' ὃ πάντες ἥμαρτον in as much as all men have sinned, since by your own argument it cannot be *in as much as all men have not sinned*; this you say cannot be, and yet you will not confess this which can be, and which S. *Paul* affirms to have been indeed: as if it were not more just and reasonable to say, that from *Adam* the curse descended unto the condemnation of the sins of the world, then to say the curse descended without consideration of their sins; but a sin must be imagined to make it seem reasonable and just to condemn us. [Now I submit it to the judgement of all the world, which way of arguing is most reasonable and concluding: You my Lord in behalf of others argue thus. Κατὰ κρίμα or condemnation cannot pass upon a man for any sin but his own:



*touching Original Sin.* 49

own: Therefore every man is truly guilty of *Adam's* sin, and that becomes his own. Against this I oppose mine. *Κατάκριμα* or condemnation cannot pass upon a man for any sin but his own: therefore it did not pass upon man for *Adam's* sin; because *Adam's* sin, was *Adam's*, not our own: But we all have sinned, we have sins of our own, therefore for these the curse pass'd from *Adam* to us. To back mine, besides that common notices of sense and reason defend it, I have the plain words of *S. Paul*; *Death passed upon all men, for as much as all men have sinned*; all men, that is, the generality of mankind, all that liv'd till they could sin, the others that died before, died in their nature, not in their sin, neither *Adam's* nor their own, save only that *Adam* brought it in upon them, or

D

rather

50 *An Answer to a Letter*

rather left it to them, himself being disrobed of all that which could hinder it.

Now for the word *ἀίματος*, which your Lordship renders [clear from sin] I am sure no man is so justified in this world, as to be clear from sin; and if we all be sinners, and yet healed as just persons, it is certain we are just by imputation only, that is, Christ imputing our faith, and sincere, though not unerring obedience to us for righteousness: And then the Antithesis must hold thus; By Christ comes justification to life, as by *Adam* came the curse or the sin to the condemnation of death: But our justification which comes by Christ is by imputation and acceptilation, by grace and favour: not that we are made really, that is, legally and perfectly righteous, but by imputation

*touching Original Sin.* 51

putation of faith and obedience to us, as if it were perfect: And therefore *Adam's* sin was but by imputation only to certain purposes; not real, or proper, not formal or inherent. For the grace by Christ is more then the sin by *Adam*: if therefore that was not legal and proper, but Evangelical and gracious, favourable and imputative, much more is the sin of *Adam* in us improperly, and by imputation. \* And truly my Lord, I think that no sound Divine of any of our Churches will say that we are *δικαιοσύνης* or *δίκαιοι* in any other sense: not that Christs righteousness is imputed to us without any inherent graces in us, but that our imperfect services, our true faith and sincere endeavours of obedience are imputed to us for righteousness through Jesus Christ: and since it is certainly

## 52 *An Answer to a Letter*

so, I am sure the Antithesis between *Christ* and *Adam* can never be salved by making us sinners really by *Adam*, and yet just or righteous by *Christ* only in acceptance and imputation. For then sin should abound more then grace; expressly against the honour of our blessed Saviour, the glory of our redemption, and the words of *S. Paul*. But rather on the contrary is it true, That though by *Christ* we were really and legally made perfectly righteous, it follows not that we were made sinners by *Adam* in the same manner and measure: for this similitude of *S. Paul* ought not to extend to an equality in all things; but still the advantage and prerogative, the abundance and the excess must be on the part of Grace: for *if sin does abound, grace does much more abound*; and  
we

*touching Original Sin.* 53

we do more partake of righteousness by *Christ*, then of sin by *Adam*. *Christ* and *Adam* are the several fountains of emanation, and are compar'd *æquè*, but not *æqualiter*. Therefore this argument holds redundantly, since by *Christ* we are not made legally righteous, but by imputation only; much less are we made sinners by *Adam*. This in my sense is so infinitely far from being an objection, that it perfectly demonstrates the main question; and for my part I mean to relie upon it.

As for that which your Lordship adds out of Rom. 5. 19. That *ἀμαρτωλοί* signifies sinners, not by imitation, as the *Pelagians* dream, but sinners really and effectively; I shall not need to make any other reply; but that 1. I do not approve of that gloss of

## 54 *An Answer to a Letter*

the *Pelagians*, that in *Adam* we are made sinners by imitation; and much less of that which affirms, we are made so properly and formally. But [made sinners] signifies, us'd like sinners; so as [justified] signifies healed like just persons: In which interpretation I follow *S. Paul*, not the *Pelagians*; they who are on the other side of the question, follow neither. And unless men take in their opinion before they read; and resolve not to understand *S. Paul* in this Epistle, I wonder why they should fancy that all that he sayes sounds that way which they commonly dream of: But as men fancy, so the Bells will ring. But I know your Lordships grave and wiser judgement, sees not only this that I have now opened, but much beyond it, and that you will be a zealous advocate  
for

*touching Original Sin. 55.*

for the truth of God, and for the honour of his justice, wisdom and mercy.

That which followes, makes me beleeve your Lordship resolv'd to try me, by speaking your own sense in the line, and your temptation in the interline. For when your Lordship had said that "[My arguments for the vindication of Gods goodness and justice are sound and holy] your hand run it over again and added [as abstracted from the case of Original Sin.] But why should this be abstracted from all the whole Oeconomy of God, from all his other dispensations? Is it in all cases of the world unjust for God, to impute our fathers sins to us unto eternal condemnation; and is it otherwise in this only? Certainly a man would think this were the more favourable case; as be-

56 *An Answer to a Letter*

ing a single act, done but once, repented of after it was done, not consented to by the parties interested, not stipulated by God that it should be so, and being against all lawes and all the reason of the world: therefore it were but reason that if any where, here much rather Gods justice and goodness should be relied upon as the measure of the event.

\* And if in other cases lawes be never given to Ideots and Infants and persons incapable, why should they be given here? but if they were not capable of a Law, then neither could they be of Sin; for where there is no law, there is no transgression. And is it unjust to condemn one man to hell for all the sin of a thousand of his Ancestors actually done by them? and shall it be accounted just to damn all the world for one sin of  
one



*touching Original Sin.* 57

one man? But if it be said, that it is unjust to damn the innocent for the sin of another; but the world is not innocent, but really guilty in *Adam*. Besides that this is a begging of the question, it is also against common sense, to say that a man is not innocent of that which was done before he had a being; for if that be not sufficient, then it is impossible for a man to be innocent. And if this way of answer be admitted, any man may be damned for the sin of any Father; because it may be said here as well as there, that although the innocent must not perish for anothers fault, yet the son is not innocent as being in his fathers loyns when the fault was committed, and the law calls him and makes him guilty. And if it were so indeed, this were so far from being an excuse, to say

D. 5.

that

## 58 *An Answer to a Letter*

that the Law makes him guilty, that this were absolute tyranny, and the thing that were to be complain'd of.

I hope, by this time your Lordship perceives, that I have no reason to fear that I prævaricate. S. Paul's rule: *μη̃ υπερφρονειν παρ' ὃ δεĩ φρονειν*. I only endeavour to understand S. Paul's words, and I read them *κατ' ἀναλογίαν πνεως*, in proportion to, and so as they may not intrench upon the reputation of Gods goodness and justice: that's *φρονειν εις τὸ σωφρονειν*, to be wise unto sobriety. But they that do so *δουλεύειν ὑποθέσει* as to resolve it to be so whether God be honour'd in it, or dishonour'd, and to answer all arguments, whether they can or cannot be answered, and to efform all their Theology to the ayre of that one great proposition, and to

*touching Original Sin.* 59

to find out waies for God to proceed in, which he hath never told of, ὁ δὲ ἄβατοι waies that are crooked and not to be insisted in, waies that are not right, if these men do not ~~ὑποφρονεῖν~~ παρ' ὃ δὲ φρονεῖν, then I hope I shall have less need to feare that I do, who do none of these things.

And in proportion to my security here, I am confident that I am unconcern'd in the consequent threatening. If any man shall Evangelize, παρ' ὃ παρελάβετε any other doctrine then what ye have received, something for Gospel which is not Gospel, something that ye have not received, let him be accursed. My Lord, if what I teach were not that which we have received, that God is just and righteous and true: that the soul that sins the same shall die: that we shall have no cause

## 60 *An Answer to a Letter*

to say, The Fathers have eaten  
sowre grapes, and the childrens  
teeth are set on edge: that God  
is a gracious Father, pardoning  
iniquity, and therefore not exact-  
ing it where it is not: that Infants  
are from their Mothers wombs  
beloved of God their Father:  
that of such is the Kingdome of  
God: that he pities those souls  
who cannot discern the right hand  
from the left, as he declar'd in  
the case of the *Ninevites*: that to  
Infants there are special Angels  
appointed who alwaies behold the  
face of God: that Christ took  
them in his arms and blessed them,  
and therefore they are not hated  
by God, and accursed heirs of  
Hell, and coheirs with Satan:  
that the Messias was promis'd be-  
fore any children were born; as  
certainly as that *Adam* sin'd be-  
fore they were born: that if sin  
abounds,

*touching Original Sin.* 61

abounds, grace does superabound ;  
and therefore children are with  
greater effect involv'd in the grace  
then they could be in the sin :  
and the sin must be gone before  
it could do them mischief: if  
this were not the doctrine of both  
Testaments, and if the contrary  
were, then the threatning of *S. Paul*  
might well be held up against  
me : but else my Lord, to shew  
such a Scorpion to him that speaks  
the truth of God in sincerity and  
humility, though it cannot make  
me to betray the truth and the  
honour of God, yet the very  
fear and affrightment which must  
needs seize upon every good man  
that does but behold it, or hear  
the words of that angry voice,  
shall and hath made me to pray  
not only that my self be preserv-  
ed in truth, but that it would  
please God to bring into the way  
of

## 62 *An Answer to a Letter*

of truth all such as have erred and are deceived.

My Lord, I humbly thank your Lordship for your grave and pious Councel, and kisse the hand that reaches forth so paternal a rod. I see you are tender both of truth and me: and though I have not made this tedious reply to cause trouble to your Lordship, or to steal from you any part of your precious time, yet because I see your Lordship was perswaded *induere personam*, to give some little countenance to a popular error out of jealousie against a less usual truth, I thought it my duty to represent to your Lordship such things, by which as I can, so I ought to be defended against captious objectors. It is hard when men will not be patient of truth, because another man offers it to them, and they did not

*touching Original Sin.* 63

not first take it in, or if they did, were not pleas'd to own it.

But from your Lordship I expect, and am sure to finde the effects of your piety, wisdom and learning, and that an error for being popular shall not prevail against so necessary, though unobserved truth. A necessary truth I call it; because without this I do not understand how we can declare 'Gods righteousness and justifie him, with whom unrighteousnesse cannot dwell: But if men of a contrary opinion, can reconcile their usual doctrines of Original Sin with Gods justice, and goodness and truth, I shall be well pleased with it, and think better of their doctrine then now I can.

But untill that be done, it were well (My Lord) if men would not trouble themselves or  
the

64      *An Answer &c.*

the Church with impertinent contradictions; but patiently give leave to have truth advanced, and God justified in his sayings and in his judgements, and the Church improved, and all errors confuted, that what did so prosperously begin the Reformation, may be admitted to bring it to perfection, that men may no longer go *quâritur*, but *quâeundum est*.

---

*The*



---

*The Bp of Rochester's  
Letter to Dr. Taylor,  
with an account of the  
particulars there given  
in charge.*

WORTHY SIR,

-----Let me request  
you to weigh that of S. Paul,  
Ephes. 2. 5. which are ur-  
ged by some Ancients : and  
to remember, how often  
he calls *Concupiscence Sin* ;  
whereby it is urg'd that  
although Baptism take a-  
way

66      *The Bishop of*

way the guilt as concretely redounding to the person, yet the simple abstracted guilt, as to the Nature remains: for Sacraments are administered to *Persons*, not to *Natures*. I confess, I finde not the Fathers so fully, and plainly speaking of Original Sin, till *Pelagius* had polluted the stream: but, after this, you may finde *S. Jerom* in *Hos.* saying, *In paradiso omnes prævaricati sunt in Adamo.* And *S. Ambrose* in *Rom. 1. 5.* *Manifestum est omnes peccasse in Adam, quasi in massâ, ex eo igitur cuncti*

Rochester's Letter. 67

*cuncti peccatores, quia ex eo sumus omnes ; and as Greg. 39 Hom. in Ezek. Sine culpâ in mundo esse non potest, qui in mundum cum culpâ venit ; But S. Austin is so frequent, so full and clear in his assertions, that his words & reasons will require your most judicious examinations, and more strict weighing of them ; he saith epist. 107. Scimus secundum Adam nos primâ nativitate contagium mortis contrahere ; nec liberamur à supplicio mortis æternæ nisi per gratiam renascamur in Christo ; Id. de verb. Apost. Ser. 4. peccatum*

68      The Bishop of

*catum à primo homine in omnes homines pertransiit, etenim illud peccatum non in fonte mansit, sed pertransiit, and Rom. 5. ubi te invenit? venundatum sub peccato, trahentem peccatum primi hominis, habentem peccatum antequam possis habere arbitrium. Id. de prædestin. & grat. c. 2. Si infans unus diei non sit sine peccato, qui proprium habere non potuit, conficitur, ut illud traxerit alienum; de quo Apost. Per unum hominem peccatum intravit in mundum; quod qui negat, negat profectò nos esse mortales; quoniam mors est*  
*pœna*

Rochester's Letter. 69

pœna peccati. Sequitur, ne-  
cesse est, pœna peccatum. Id.  
enchir. c. 9. 29. Sola gra-  
tia redemptos discernit à  
perditis, quos in unam per-  
ditionis massam concreverat  
ab origine ducta communis  
contagio, Id. de peccator. mer.  
& remiss. l. 1. c. 3. Concupi-  
scentia carnis peccatum est,  
quia inest illi inobedientia  
contra dominatum mentis;  
Quid potest, aut potuit nasci  
ex servo, nisi servus? ideo  
sicut omnis homo ab Adamo  
est, ita & omnis homo per  
Adamum servus est peccati.  
Rom. 5. Falluntur ergo om-  
nino, qui dicunt mortem so-  
lam,

lam, non & peccatum tran-  
 sisse in genus humanum. Pro-  
 sper. resp. ad articulum Au-  
 gustino falsò impositum; Om-  
 nes homines prævaricationis  
 reos, & damnationi obnoxios  
 nasci periturosq; nisi in Cbri-  
 sto renascamur, asserimus.  
 Tho. 12. q. 8. Secundum fi-  
 dem Catholicam tenendum est,  
 quod primum peccatum pri-  
 mi hominis, originaliter tran-  
 sit in posteros, propter quod  
 etiam pueri mox nati defe-  
 runt ad baptismum ab in-  
 teriore culpâ abluendi. Con-  
 trarium est hæresis Pelag. un-  
 de peccatum quod sic à pri-  
 mo parente derivatur, dici-  
 tur

Rochester's Letter. 71

citur Originale, sicut peccatum, quod ab animâ derivatur ad membra corporis, dicitur actuale. Bonavent. in 2. sent. dist. 31. Sicut peccatum actuale tribuitur alicui ratione singularis personae: ita peccatum originale tribuitur ratione Naturae; corpus infectum traducitur, quia persona Adæ infecta naturam, & natura infecta personam. Anima enim inficitur à carne per colligantiam, quum unita carni traxit ad se alterius proprietates. Lombard. 2. Sent. dist. 31. Peccatum originale per corruptionem carnis, in animâ fit: in vase enim dig-

72      *The Bishop &c.*

*dignoscitur vitium esse, quod  
vinum accescit.*

If you take into consideration the Covenant made between Almighty God and *Adam* as relating to his posterity, it may conduce to the satisfaction of those who urge it for a proof of Original Sin. Now that the work may prosper under your hands to the manifestation of Gods glory, the edification of the Church, and the satisfaction of all good Christians, is the hearty prayer of

Your fellow Servant in our most  
Blessed Lord Christ Jesu.

*Jo. Rossens.*



*My Lord,*

**I** Perceive that you have a great Charity to every one of the sons of the Church, that your Lordship refuses not to sollicite their objections, and to take care that every man be answered that can make objections against my Doctrine; but as your charity makes you refuse no work or labour of love: so shall my duty and obedience make me ready to perform any commandement that can be relative to so excellent a principle.

I am indeed sorry your Lordship is thus haunted with objections about the Question of Ori-  
E
ginal

## 74 *An Answer to a Letter*

ginal Sin; but because you are pleas'd to hand them to me, I cannot think them so inconsiderable as in themselves they seem; for what your Lordship thinks worthy the reporting from others, I must think are fit to be answered and returned by me.

In your Lordships of *November*, 10. these things I am to reply to:

*Let me request you to weigh that of S. Paul Ephes. 2. 5. The words are these [ Even when we were dead in sins, (God) hath quickned us together with Christ ]* which words I do not at all suppose relate to the matter of *Original Sin*, but to the state of *Heathen sins, habitual Idolatries and impurities*; in which the world was dead before the great Reformation by Christ. And I do not know any *Expositor* of note that suspects any other

## *touching Original Sin. 75*

other sense of it ; and the second verse of that chapter makes it so certain and plain, that it is too visible to insist upon it longer. But your Lordship addes further.

*And to remember how often he calls concupiscence Sin ]* I know S. Paul reckons *Concupiscence* to be one of the works of the flesh, and consequently such as excludes from heaven, Col. 3. 5. *Evil concupiscence* ] concupiscence with something superadded, but certainly that is nothing that is *natural* ; for God made nothing that is evil, and whatsoever is *natural* and *necessary* cannot be mortified ; but this may and must, and the Apostle calls upon us to do it ; but that this is a super-inducing, and an *actual* or *habitual* *lusting* appears by the following words, vers. 7. *in which*

## 76 *An Answer to a Letter*

ye also walked sometimes when ye lived in them, such a concupiscence as that which is the effect of habitual sins or an estate of sins, of which the Apostle speaks, Rom. 7.8. *Sin taking occasion by the commandement wrought in me all manner of concupiscence*; that is, so great a state of evil, such strong inclinations and desires to sin, that I grew as captive under it; it introduced a necessity like those in S. Peter, who had eyes *μεσὲς πορνείας* full of an Adulteress: the women had possessed their eyes, and therefore they were *ἀναλίσκοντες τὴν ἀμαρτίαν* they could not cease from sin: because having *πάναν ἰνθυμίαν* all concupiscence, that is the very spirit of sinful desires, they could relish nothing but the productions of sin, they could fancy nothing but Colloquintida and Toadstools of the earth. \* Once more

## touching Original Sin. 77

I finde S. Paul speaking of Concupiscence, 1 Theff. 4. 5. Let every man know to possess his vessel in holiness and Honour, not in the lust of concupiscence, as do the Gentiles which know not God. In the lust of Concupiscence, that is plainly in lustfulness and impurity: for it is a Hebraism, where a superlative is usually expressed by the synonymon: as *Lutum cæni*; *pluvia imbris*; so the Gall of bitterness and the iniquity of sins; *Robur virium*; the blackness of darkness, that is, *οὐρανός ἐξ ὕψους*, the outer darkness, or the greatest darkness: so here the lust of Concupiscence, that is, the vilest and basest of it. I know no where else that the Apostle uses the word in any sense. But the like is to be said of the word *lust*, which the Apostle often uses, for the habits produced or the preg-

## 78 *An Answer to a Letter*

*nant desires*, but never for the natural principle and affection, when he speaks of sin.

But your Lordship is pleased to adde a subtlety in pursuance of your former advices and notices, which I confess I shall never understand.

*Although Baptism take away the guilt as concretively redounding to the person, yet the simple abstracted guilt as to the Nature remains; for Sacraments are administered to persons, not to natures]* Thus I suppose those persons from whom your Lordship reports it, intended as an answer to a secret objection. For if Concupiscence be a sin, and yet remains after baptism, then what good does Baptism effect? But if it be no sin after, then it is no sin before. To this it is answered as you see: there is a double

## *touching Original Sin. 79*

double guilt; *a guilt of person, and of nature.* That is taken away, *this* is not: for, Sacraments are given to Persons, not to Natures.

But first, where is there such a distinction set down in Scripture, or in the prime antiquity, or in any moral Philosopher? There is no humane nature but what is in the persons of men; and though our understanding can make a separate consideration of these, or rather consider a person in a double capacity, in his personal and in his natural, that is (if I am to speak sense) a person may be considered in that which is proper to him, and in that which is common to him and others; yet these two considerations cannot make two distinct subjects capable of such different events. I will put it to the trial.

E 4

This

## 80 *An Answer to a Letter*

This guilt that is in nature, what is it? Is it the same thing that was in the person? that is, is it an obligation to punishment? If it be not, I know not the meaning of the word, and therefore I have nothing to do with it. If it be, then if this guilt or obligation to punishment remains in the nature after it is taken from the person, then if this concupiscence deserve damnation, this nature shall be damned, though the person be saved. Let the Objectors, my Lord, choose which they will. If it does not deserve damnation, why do they say it does? If it does, then the guilty may suffer what they deserve, but the innocent or the absolved must not; the person then being acquitted, and the nature not acquitted, the nature shall be damn'd and the person be saved.

But



*touching Original Sin.* 81

But if it be said that the guilt remains in the *nature* to certain purposes, but not to all; then I reply, so it does in the *person*; for it is in the *person* after Baptism, so as to be a perpetual possibility and proneness to sin, and a principle of trouble; and if it be no otherwise in the *nature*, then this distinction is to no purpose; if it be otherwise in the *nature*, then it brings damnation to it, when it brings none to the Man, and then the former argument must return. But whether it prevail or no, yet I cannot but note, that what is here affirmed is expressly against the words commonly attributed to S. Cyprian (*De ablutione pedum*) *Sic abluit quos parentalis labes infecerat, ut nec actualis nec Originalis macula post ablutionem illam ulla sui vestigia derelinquat*: How this supposing

## 82 *An Answer to a Letter*

it of Baptism can be reconcil'd with the guilt remaining in the nature, I confess I cannot give an account. It is expressly against S. Austin (Tom. 9. Tract. 41. in Joh. epist. ad Ocean.) saying, *deleta est tota iniquitas!* expressly against S. Hierom, *Quomodo justificati sumus & sanctificati, si peccatum aliquid in nobis relinquitur?*

But again (My Lord) I did suppose that *Concupiscence* or *Original Sin* had been founded in nature, and had not been a *personal* but a *natural* evil. I am sure, so the Article of our Church affirms; *it is the fault and corruption of our Nature.* And so S. Bonaventure affirms in the words cited by your Lordship in your Letter: *Sicut peccatum actuale tribuitur alicui ratione singularis personae: ita peccatum origi-*  
*nis.*

*quis tribuitur ratione natura.* Either then the Sacrament must have effect upon our Nature, to purifie that which is vitiated by Concupiscence, or else it does no good at all. For if the guilt or sin be founded in the nature, (as the Article affirms) and Baptism does not take off the guilt from the nature, then it does nothing.

Now since your Lordship is pleas'd in the behalf of the objectors so warily to avoid what they thought pressing, I will take leave to use the advantages it ministers: for so the Serpent teaches us where to strike him, by his so warily and guiltily defending his head. I therefore argue thus.

Either Baptism does not take off the guilt of Original Sin, or else there may be punishment where

## 84 *An Answer to a Letter*

where there is no guilt, or else natural death was not it which God threatned as the punishment of *Adam's* fact. For it is certain, that all men die as well after baptism as before; and more after then before. That which would be properly the consequent of this Dilemma, is this, that when God threatned death to *Adam*, saying, *On the day thou eatest of the tree thou shalt die the death*, he inflicted and intended to inflict the evils of a troublesome mortallife. For *Adam* did not die that day, but *Adam* began to be miserable that day, to live upon hard labour, to eat fruits from an accursed field, till he should return to the earth whence he was taken. (Gen. 3. 17, 18, 19.) So that death in the common sense of the word was to be the end of his labour,  
not

*touching Original Sin.* 85

not so much the punishment of the sin. For it is probable he should have gone off from the scene of this world to a better, though he had not sin'd; but if he had not sin'd, he should not be so afflicted, and he should not have died *daily* till he had died *finally*, that is, till he had returned to his dust whence he was taken, and whither he would naturally have gone: and it is no new thing in Scripture that miseries and infelicities should be called *dying* or *death*. (Exod. 10. 17. 1 Cor. 15. 31. 2 Cor. 1. 10. & 4. 10, 11, 12. & 11. 23.) But I only note this as probable; as not being willing to admit what the *Socinians* answer in this argument; who affirm that God threatening death to the Sin of *Adam*, meant *death eternal*: which is certainly not true; as we learn  
from

## 86 *An Answer to a Letter*

from the words of the Apostle, saying, *In Adam we all die*; which is not true of *death eternal*, but it is true of the miseries and calamities of mankind, and it is true of temporal death in the sense now explicated, and in that which is commonly received.

But I add also this probleme. That which would have been, had there been no sin, and that which remains when the sin or guiltiness is gone, is not properly the punishment of the sin. But dissolution of the soul and body should have been, if *Adam* had not sin'd, for the world would have been too little to have entertain'd those myriads of men which must in all reason have been born from that blessing of *Increase and multiply*, which was given at the first Creation; and to have confin'd mankind to the  
plea-

## *touching Original Sin.* 87

pleasures of this world, in case he had not fallen, would have been a punishment of his innocence; but however, it might have been, though God had not been angry, and shall still be, even when the sin is taken off. The proper consequent of this will be, that when the Apostle sayes, *Death came in by sin*, and that *Death is the wages of sin*, he primarily and literally means the solemnities, and causes, and infelicities, and untimeliness of temporal death, and not meerly the dissolution, which is directly no evil, but an inlet to a better state. But I insist not on this, but offer it to the consideration of inquisitive and modest persons.

And now that I may return thither from whence this objection brought me; I consider, that if any should urge this argument to me:

Baptism delivers from Original Sin.

Bapt.

## 88 *An Answer to a Letter*

Baptism does not deliver from *Concupiscence*; therefore *Concupiscence* is not Original Sin.

I did not know well what to answer; I could possibly say something to satisfy the boyes & young men at a publique disputation, but not to satisfy my self when I am upon my knees and giving an account to God of all my secret and hearty perswasions. But I consider, that by *Concupiscence* must be meant either the first inclinations to their object; or the proper acts of Election which are the second acts of *Concupiscence*. If the first inclinations be meant, then certainly that cannot be a sin which is *natural*, and which is *necessary*. For I consider that *Concupiscence* and natural desires are like *hunger*; which while it is natural and necessary, is not for the destruction but conservation of



*touching Original Sin.* 89

of man ; when it goes beyond the limits of nature, it is violent and a disease : and so is *Concupiscence* ; But desires or lustings when they are taken for the natural propensity to their proper object, are so far from being a sin, that they are the instruments of felicity for this duration, and when they grow towards being irregular, they may, if we please, grow instruments of felicity in order to the other duration, because they may serve a vertue by being restrained ; And to *desire* that to which all men tend naturally, is no more a sin then to desire to be happy is a sin : *desire* is no more a sin then *joy* or *sorrow* is : neither can it be fancied why one passion more then another can be in its whole nature Criminal ; either all or none are so ; when any of them growes irregular or  
inor-

90 *An Answer to a Letter*

inordinate, Joy is as bad as Desire, and Fear as bad as either.

But if by *Concupiscence* we mean the second acts of it, that is, avoidable consentings, and deliberate elections, then let it be as much condemned as the Apostle and all the Church after him hath sentenc'd it; but then it is not *Adam's* sin, but our own by which we are condemned; for it is not his fault that we choose; If we choose, it is our own; if we choose not, it is no fault. For there is a natural act of the Will as well as of the Understanding, and in the choice of the supreme Good, and in the first apprehension of its proper object, the Will is as natural as any other faculty; and the other faculties have degrees of adherence as well as the Will: so have the operative and intellectual faculties; they are *delighted*

*touching Original Sin.* 91

*lighted* in their best objects. But because these only are natural, and the will is natural sometimes, but not alwaies, there it is that a difference can be.

For I consider, if the first Concupiscence be a sin, Original Sin, (for actual it is not) and that this is *properly, personally, and inherently* our sin by traduction, that is, if our will be necessitated to sin by *Adam's* fall, as it must needs be if it can sin when it cannot deliberate, then there can be no reason told, why it is more a sin to will evil, then to understand it: and how does that which is moral differ from that which is natural? for the understanding is first and primely moved by its object, and in that motion by nothing else but by God, who moves all things: and if that which hath nothing else to move it but the  
object,

## 92 *An Answer to a Letter*

object, yet is not free; it is strange that the will can in any sense be free, when it is necessitated by *wisdom* and by *power*, and by *Adam*, that is, *from within* and *from without*, besides what *God* and *violence* do and can do.

But in this I have not only Scripture and all the reason of the world on my side, but the complying sentences of the most eminent writers of the Primitive Church; I need not trouble myself with citations of many of them, since *Calvin* (*lib. 3. Instit. c. 3. § 10.*) confesses that *S. Austin* hath collected their testimonies and is of their opinion, that *Concupiscence* is not a *sin*, but an *infirmity* only. But I will here set down the words of *S. Chrysostome* (*Homil. 13. in epist. Rom.*) because they are very clear; *Ipsæ passionēs in se peccatum non sūnt*  
Es-

## touching Original Sin. 93

*Effrenata verò ipsarum immoderantia peccatum operata est. Concupiscentia quidem peccatum non est quando verò egressa modum foras eruperit, tunc demum adulterinum fit, non à concupiscentia sed à nimio & illicito illius luxu.*

By the way I cannot but wonder why men are pleased, where ever they finde the word *Concupiscence* in the New Testament, presently to dream of *Original Sin*, and make that to be the sum total of it; whereas *Concupiscence* if it were the product of *Adam's* fall, is but one small part of it; [*Et ut exempli gratia unam illarum tractem*] said *S. Chrysostome* in the forecited place; *Concupiscence* is but one of the passions, and in the utmost extension of the word, it can be taken but for one half of the passion; for not only all the passions of the Con-

## 94 *An Answer to a Letter*

Concupiscible faculty can be a principle of sin, but the Irascible does more hurt in the world; *that is more sensual, this is more devillish.* The reason why I note this, is because upon this account it will seem, that *concupiscence* is no more to be called a sin then *anger* is, and as *S. Paul* said, *Be angry, but sin not*; so he might have said, *Desire, or lust, but sin not.* For there are some lustings and desires without sin, as well as some Angers; and that which is indifferent to vertue and vice, cannot of it self be a vice; To which I add, that if *Concupiscence* taken for all desires be a sin, then so are all the passions of the Irascible faculty. Why one more then the other is not to be told, but that Anger in the first motions is not a sin, appears, because it is not alwaies sinful in the second; a man may be

## **touching Original Sin. 95**

be actually angry, and yet really innocent: and so he may be *lustful* and *full of desire*, and yet he may be not only that which is good, or he may overcome his desires to that which is bad. I have now considered what your Lordship received from others, and gave me in charge your self, concerning concupiscence.

Your next charge is concerning *Antiquity*, intimating that although the first antiquity is not clearly against me, yet the second is. For thus your Lordship is pleased to write their objection [*I confess I finde not the Fathers so fully and plainly speaking of Original Sin, till Pelagius had polluted the stream; but after this you may finde S. Jerom &c.*]

That the Fathers of the first 400 years did speak plainly and fully of it, is so evident as nothing  
more,

96 *An Answer to a Letter*

more, and I appeal to their testimonies as they are set down in the papers annexed in their proper place; and therefore that must needs be one of the little arts by which some men use to escape from the pressure of that authority, by which because they would have other men concluded, sometimes upon strict inquiry they finde themselves entangled. Original Sin as it is at this day commonly explicated, was not the Doctrine of the primitive Church; but when *Pelagius* had pudled the stream, *S. Austin* was so angry that he stampt and disturb'd it more: and truly my Lord, I do not think that the Gentlemen that urg'd against me *S. Austin's* opinion, do well consider that I profess my self to follow those fathers who were before him; and whom *S. Austin* did forsake as I do



*touching Original Sin.* 97

do him in the question. They may as well press me with his authority in the Article of the damnation of Infants dying unbaptized, or of absolute predestination. In which Article, *S. Austin's* words are equally urged by the *Fansenists* and *Molinists*, by the *Remonstrants* and *Contra-remonstrants*, and they can serve both, and therefore cannot determine me. But then (My Lord) let it be remembred, that they are as much against *S. Chrysostome* as I am against *S. Austin*, with this only difference; that *S. Chrysostome* speaks constantly in the argument, which *S. Austin* did not, and particularly in that part of it which concerns *Concupiscence*. For in the inquiry, whether it be a sin or no; he speaks so variously, that though *Calvin* complains of him, that he calls

F

it

98 *An Answer to a Letter*

it only an *infirmity*, yet he also brings testimonies from him to prove it to be a *sin*, and let any man try if he can tie these words together. (*De peccator. mer. et remission. l. i. c. 3.*) *Concupiscentia carnis peccatum est, quia inest illi inobedientia contra dominatum mentis.* Which are the words your Lordship quotes: Concupiscence is a sin because it is a disobedience to the Empire of the spirit. But yet in another place; (*lib. i. de civit. Dei cap. 25.*) *Illa Concupiscentialis inobedientia quanto magis absq; culpa est in corpore non consentientis, si absq; culpa est in corpore dormientis?* It is a sin and it is no sin, it is criminal, but is without fault; it is culpable because it is a disobedience, and yet this disobedience without actual consent is not culpable. If I do believe *S. Austin*, I must disbelieve

*touching Original Sin.* 99

leeve him ; and which part soever I take, I shall be reprov'd by the same authority. But when the Fathers are divided from each other, or themselves, it is indifferent to follow either ; but when any of them are divided from reason and Scripture, then it is not indifferent for us to follow *them*, and neglect *these* ; and yet if these who object *S. Austin's* authority to my Doctrine, will be content to subject to all that he saies, I am content they shall follow him in this too, provided that they will give me my liberty because I will not be tied to him that speaks contrary things to himself, and contrary to them that went before him ; and though he was a rare person, yet he was as fallible as any of my brethren at this day. He was followed by many ignorant ages, and all the world

## 100 *An Answer to a Letter*

knowes by what accidental advantages he acquired a great reputation: but he who made no scruple of deserting all his predecessors, must give us leave upon the strength of his own reasons to quit his authority.

All that I shall observe is this, that the Doctrine of *Original Sin* as it is explicated by *S. Austin*, had two parents; one was the Doctrine of the *Encratites*, and some other Hereticks, who forbad Marriage, and supposing it to be evill, thought they were warranted to say, it was the bed of sin, and children the spawn of vipers and sinners. And *S. Austin* himself, and especially *S. Hierom* (whom your Lordship cites) speaks some things of marriage, which if they were true, then marriage were highly to be refused, as being the increaser of sin rather than of chil-

*touching Original Sin.* 101

children, and a semination in the flesh, and contrary to the spirit, and such a thing which being mingled with sin, produces univocal issues, the mother and the daughter are so like that they are the worse again. For if a proper inherent sin be effected by chaste marriages, then they are in this particular equal to adulterous embraces, and rather to be *pardoned* then *allowed*; and if all *Concupiscence* be vicious, then no marriage can be pure. These things it may be have not been so much considered, but your Lordship I know remembers strange sayings in *S. Hierom*, in *Athenagoras*, and in *S. Austin*, which possibly have been countenanced and maintained at the charge of this opinion. But the other parent of this is the zeal against the *Pelagian* Heresie, which did serve it self

## 102 *An Answer to a Letter*

by saying too little in this Article, and therefore was thought fit to be confuted by saying too much; and that I conjecture right in this affair, I appeal to the words which I cited out of S. *Austin* in the matter of *Concupiscence*; concerning which he speaks the same thing that I do, when he is disingaged; as in his books *De civitate Dei*: but in his *Traetate de peccatorum meritis & remissione*, which was written in his heat against the *Pelagians* he speaks quite contrary. And who ever shall with observation read his one book of *Original Sin* against *Pelagius*, his two books *de Nuptiis & Concupiscentia* to *Valerius*, his three books to *Marcellinus*, *de peccatorum meritis & remissione*, his four books to *Boniface*, *contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum*, his six books to *Claudius* against *Fu-*  
*lianus*,

*touching Original Sin.* 103

*lianus*, and shall think himself bound to beleve all that this excellent man wrote, will not only finde it impossible he should, but will have reason to say, that zeal against an error is not alwaies the best instrument to finde out truth. The same complaint hath been made of others; and *S. Jerome* hath suffer'd deeply in the infirmity. I shall not therefore trouble your Lordship with giving particular answers to the words of *S. Jerom* and *S. Ambrose*, because (besides what I have already said) I do not think that their words are an argument fit to conclude against so much evidence, nor against a much less then that which I have every where brought in this Article, though indeed their words are capable of a fair interpretation, and besides the words quoted out

## 102 *An Answer to a Letter*

by saying too little in this Article, and therefore was thought fit to be confuted by saying too much; and that I conjecture right in this affair, I appeal to the words which I cited out of S. *Austin* in the matter of *Concupiscence*; concerning which he speaks the same thing that I do, when he is disingaged; as in his books *De civitate Dei*: but in his *Traetate de peccatorum meritis & remissione*, which was written in his heat against the *Pelagians* he speaks quite contrary. And whoever shall with observation read his one book of *Original Sin* against *Pelagius*, his two books *de Nuptiis & Concupiscentia* to *Valerius*, his three books to *Marcellinus*, *de peccatorum meritis & remissione*, his four books to *Boniface*, *contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum*, his six books to *Claudius* against *Fu-*  
*lianus*,



*lianus*, and shall think himself bound to beleve all that this excellent man wrote, will not only finde it impossible he should, but will have reason to say, that zeal against an error is not alwaies the best instrument to finde out truth. The same complaint hath been made of others; and *S. Jerome* hath suffer'd deeply in the infirmity. I shall not therefore trouble your Lordship with giving particular answers to the words of *S. Jerom* and *S. Ambrose*, because (besides what I have already said) I do not think that their words are an argument fit to conclude against so much evidence, nor against a much less then that which I have every where brought in this Article, though indeed their words are capable of a fair interpretation, and besides the words quoted out

104 *An Answer to a Letter*

of *S. Ambrose* are none of his; and for *Aquinas, Lombard, and Bonaventure*, your Lordship might as well press me with the opinion of *Mr. Calvin, Knox and Buchannan*, with the Synod of *Dort*, or the *Scots Presbyteries*: I know they are against me, and therefore I reprove them for it, but it is no disparagement to the truth, that other men are in error. And yet of all the Schoolmen, *Bonaventure* should least have been urg'd against me, for the proverbs sake: for, *Adam non peccavit in Bonaventura*; *Alexander of Hales* would often say, that *Adam* never sin'd in *Bonaventure*. But it may be he was not in earnest: no more am I.

The last thing your Lordship gives to me in charge in the behalf of the objectors, is that *I would take into consideration the*  
Co-

*touching Original Sin. 105*

*Covenant made between Almighty God and Adam, as relating to his posterity.*

To this I answer, that I know of no such thing; God made a covenant with *Adam* indeed, and us'd the right of his dominion over his posterity, and yet did nothing but what was just; but I finde in Scripture no mention made of any such Covenant as is dreamt of about the matter of original sin: only the Covenant of works God did make with all men till Christ came; but he did never exact it after *Adam*; but for a Covenant that God should make with *Adam*, that if he stood, all his posterity should be I know not what; and if he fell, they should be in a damnable condition, of this (I say) there is *nec vo-*  
*la nec vestigium* in holy Scripture, that ever I could meet

with: if there had been any such covenant, it had been but equity that to all the persons interessed it should have been communicated, and caution given to all who were to suffer, and abilities given to them to prevent the evil: for else it is not a Covenant with them, but a decree concerning them; and it is impossible that there should be a covenant made between two, when one of the parties knowes nothing of it.

I will enter no further into this enquiry, but only observe, that though there was no such covenant, yet the event that hapned might without any such covenant have justly entred in at many doors. It is one thing to say that God by *Adam's* sin was moved to a severer intercourse with his posterity, for that is certainly true; and it is another thing

touching Original Sin. 107

thing to say that *Adam's* sin of it self did deserve all the evill that came actually upon his children; Death is the wages of sin, one death for one sin; but not 10000 millions for one sin; but therefore the Apostle affirms it to have descended on all, *in as much as all men have sinned*; But if from a sinning Parent a good childe descends; the childs innocence will more prevail with God for kindness, then the fathers sin shall prevail for trouble. *Non omnia parentum peccata dii in liberos convertunt, sed si quis de malo nascitur bonus, tanquam bene affectus, corpore natus de morbofo, is generis pœna liberatur, tanquam ex improbitatis domo, in aliam familiam datus: qui vero morbo in similitudinem generis referatur atq; redigitur vitiosi, ei nimium convenit tanquam heredi debitas*

## 108 *An Answer to a Letter*

*debitas pœnas vitii persolvere*, said Plutarch (*De iis qui sero à Numine puniuntur. ex interpr. Cluserii.*) God does not alwaies make the fathers sins descend upon the children. But if a good childe is born of a bad father, like a healthful body from an ill affected one, he is freed from the punishment of his stock, and passes from the house of wickedness into another family. But he who inherits the disease, he also must be heir of the punishment; *Quorum natura amplexa est cognatam malitiam, hos Juslitia similitudinem pravitatis persequens supplicio affecit*, if they pursue their kindreds wickedness, they shall be pursued by a cognation of judgement.

Other waies there are by which it may come to pass that the sins of others may descend upon us. He

## *touching Original Sin.* 109

He that is *author* or the *perswader*, the *minister* or the *helper*, the *approver* or the *follower*, may derive the sins of others to himself, but then it is not their sins only, but our own too, and it is like a dead taper put to a burning light and held there, this derives light and flames from the other, and yet then hath it of its own, but they dwell together and make one body. These are the waies by which punishment can enter, but there are evils which are no punishments, and they may come upon more accounts, by *Gods Dominion*, by *natural consequence*, by *infection*, by *destitution* and *derection*, for the *glory of God*, by right of authority, for the *institution* or *exercise* of the sufferers, or for their *more immediate good*.

But

## 110 *An Answer to a Letter*

But that directly and properly one should be punish'd for the sins of others was indeed practised by some Common-wealths; *Utilitatis specie sapissimè in re-pub. peccari*, said *Cicero*, they do it sometimes for terror, and because their waies of preventing evil is very imperfect: and when *Pedianus secundus* the *Pretor* was kill'd by a slave, all the family of them was kill'd in punishment; this was *secundum veterem morem* said *Tacit.* (*Annal.* 14.) for in the slaughter of *Marcellus* the slaves fled for fear of such usage; it was thus, I say, among the *Romans*, but *habuit aliquid iniqui*, and God forbid we should say such things of the fountain of Justice and mercy. But I have done, and will move no more stones, but hereafter carry them as long as I can, rather then make a noise by throwing



*touching Original Sin.* VII

throwing them down; I shall only add this one thing: I was troubled with an objection lately; for it being propounded to me, why it is to be beleev'd that the sin of *Adam* could spoil the nature of man, and yet the nature of Devils could not be spoiled by their sin which was worse; I could not well tell what to say, and therefore I held my peace.

---

*THE END.*



*An Advertisement to the Reader.*

**P**ag. 8, & 9 there are seven lines misplaced, which are to be read thus: pag. 8. lin. 16. read, till the body was grown up to strength enough to infect it] [and in the whole process it must be an impossible thing, because the instrument which hath all its operations by the force of the principal agent, cannot of it self produce a great change and violent effect upon the principal agent] Besides all this, (I say) while one does not know how Original Sin can be derived, and another who thinks he can, names a wrong way, and both the waies infer it to be another kinde of thing then all the Schools of learning teach: does it not too clearly demonstrate,——



The names of several Treatises and  
Sermons written by *Jer. Taylor D.D.*

1. **E***New* 7ds, a Course of Sermons for  
all the Sundaies in the year,  
together with a Discourse of the  
Divine Institution, Necessity and  
Separation of the Office Ministerial, in *fol.*
2. Episcopacy asserted, in 4.
3. The History of the Life and Death  
of the Ever-blessed Jesus Christ,  
2. Edit. in *fol.*
4. The Liberty of Propheſying, in 4.
5. An Apologie for authoris'd and  
Set-formes of Liturgie, in 4.
6. The Rule and Exercises of holy li-  
ving, in 12.
7. The Rule and Exercises of holy  
dying, in 12.
8. The Golden Grove, or, A Manual  
of daily Prayers fitted to the daies  
of the week, together with a short  
Method of Peace and Holiness.
9. The Doctrine an practice of repen-  
tance rescued from popular Er-  
rors, in a large 8. Newly published.

Books written by *H. Hammond*. D. D.

- A** Paraphrase and Annotations upon all the Books of the New Test. by *H. Hammond* D.D. in fol.
2. *The Practical Catechism*, with all other English Treatises of *H. Hammond*, D. D. in two volumes in 4.
  3. *Dissertationes quatuor, quibus Episcopatus Jura ex S. Scripturis & primæva Antiquitate adstruuntur, contra sententiam D. Blondelli & aliorum. Authore Henrico Hammond*, in 4.
  4. *A Letter of Resolution of six Queries*, in 12.
  5. *Of Schism. A Defence of the Church of England, against the Exceptions of the Romanists*, in 12.
  6. *Of Fundamentals in a notion referring to practice*, by *H. Hammond* D. D. in 12.
  7. *Six books of late Controversie in defence of the Church of England*, in two volumes in 4. newly published.

Books

## Books newly published.

**D**Octor *Cousins* Devotions, in 12.

The persecuted Ministry, by *William Langley* late of *St. Maries* in the City of *Liechfield*, Minister, in 4.

A Discourse of Auxiliary Beauty, or Artificial Handsomenesse. In point of Conscience between two Ladies, in 8.

*Lyford's* Legacy ; or, an help to young People. Preparing them for the worthy receiving of the Lords Supper, in 12.

The Principles of Holy Christian Religion : or the Catechism of the Church of England paraphrazed. By *R. Sherlock* B. D. at *Borwick Hall* in *Lancashire*, in 8.

A Discourse 1. Of the Holy Spirit of God, His Impressions and workings on the Souls of Men. 2. Of Divine Revelation, Mediate and Immediate. 3. Of Error, Heresie, and Schism : the Nature, Kindes, Causes, Reasons, and Dangers thereof : with directions for avoiding the same. By *R. Sherlock*, B. D. in 4.

**THE END.**